NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLXXXII.

JANUARY, 1897.

THE MEANING OF THE VOTES.

BY SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, OF MASSACHUSETTS.

NOTHING is more unprofitable than the "might have beens" of history or politics. The computations by which it is shown that, if a few thousand votes had been changed in one place and a few thousand more somewhere else, then the result of the Presidential election would have been different, are not only meaningless but harmful. The single statement that it is no easier but actually more difficult to change votes when the margin is narrow and political lines tightly drawn than when the margin is wide and party ties loose really disposes of the whole thing. They are harmful because they are able by a certain fallacious picturesqueness to disturb and agitate many people who do not stop to analyze them. This calculation and solemn setting forth of practically impossible hypotheses is a favorite amusement after elections. It was indulged in in 1892, and has had its run again in 1896. But these computations and imaginings are not worth a moment's serious thought nor the paper used to print them.

But while the "might have beens" are flat and unprofitable, it is both useful and profitable to examine the actual facts disclosed by the votes after a national election and especially after an election as momentous as that through which we have just passed. Such an examination seems especially desirable at this time, when many persons who in October would have found complete joy and salvation in the election of McKinley by a majority of one

Copyright, 1896, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

electoral vote are now grumbling and shaking their heads because he did not have a hundred and fifty. Such utterances and such a state of mind are especially undesirable now when the business confidence, for which at last we have good ground, should be stimulated and not checked and depressed.

My purpose here, therefore, is to sketch briefly the situation which led up to the political campaign just concluded, and then by a few simple tables to show what the votes which decided that campaign really meant and what they represented. The elections of 1893, 1894, and 1895 were fought exclusively upon the tariff, and their overwhelmingly Republican results made it obvious that the people were not only convinced that the Democrats were a failure in office, but that they were also against low tariffs and in favor of protection. When a party elected to power on a distinct declaration in favor of free trade found itself unable to frame or pass anything but a tariff protective in principle, it became clear that the vast majority of the American people adhered to protection. This was confirmed by the election results of three successive years. The voters clearly did not want free trade, and were sick of the attempts made in that direction under the guise of tariff reform. Thus it became plain to everybody, except to those few persons whose horizon was so small that it was completely filled by the figure of Mr. Cleveland, that on the tariff issue the party of protection would carry the country, and win a sweeping victory. In the question of free silver some of the Southern Democratic leaders saw a means of escape, not only from national defeat, but what was far more important to them, from the loss of their own States to the Populists. In the election of 1892, Mr. Cleveland, although he had a plurality of nearly 400,000, was in a minority on the total popular vote of close on to a million. If by free silver the Populists could be united to the Democrats, victory was certainly possible if not probable.

The plan of these leaders was to confine the campaign to the silver issue, but when they got to Chicago they found it was easier to light a fire than to control it. They had broken down the old leadership of the Democratic party in the North and a new element had come in. This new element cared little for the silver question except as a means to an end. What they desired was to make a general attack on all existing institutions. Under

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the able lead of Governor Altgeld they embodied in the platform a demand for repudiation, for the overthrow of the powers of the Court, for making the courts a mere mouthpiece of the victorious political party, and for the destruction of the Executive power of enforcing law. When this platform was first published, these clauses struck the country as merely wild declarations put forward without consideration in the hope of catching certain bodies of voters. But, as the campaign proceeded, it became clear to every one that, instead of being a collection of reckless and crazy utterances without cohesion or plan, it was a well-drawn and carefully thought out scheme based on socialistic and anarchistic theories imported from Europe and involving, if successful, nothing short of a revolution in our form of government.

As the discussion went on and the weeks passed, the silver question dropped more and more into the background. The theatrical declaimer who won the nomination by arresting at a critical moment the wandering fancy of the Convention first dropped from his repertoire the question of the tariff. Four years before he had been proclaiming to all who would listen that free trade would bring the millennium and the overthrow of all those wicked persons and combinations engaged in the criminal pursuit of earning and saving money. In 1896 he had forgotten the panacea of 1892. In all his miles of talk and acres of words there is hardly an allusion to tariff. At the beginning his speeches were devoted almost exclusively to the money question. He even tried at Madison Square to discuss it seriously and he never wholly abandoned it, but gradually it assumed a less and less important place in his declamation. More and more he was impelled by the forces which had put the revolutionary clauses into the Democratic platform to devote himself to passionate appeals along these lines. His action, which was the result not of thought but of the governing forces of the contests, illustrates the single point I desire to make, which is that the real question finally developed during the campaign was whether we should hold to the principles of government and the traditions of law and order which have been characteristic of the American people, or whether we should break down all these principles and traditions and enter upon a new line of experiment and probably of revolution. No graver question was ever submitted to any people for decision at the ballot box at a single election. The result of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the voting therefore becomes of the utmost importance, and its true significance should be rightly understood so that we may know what it means and what it portends in the future.

Let us note, first, exactly what the result of the voting was on the popular vote, which is much more instructive than the electoral vote, and see how it compares with the previous elections. The following table gives these statistics:

TABLE I.

POPULAR MAJORITY AND PLURALITY OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS.

Year.	Candidates.	Popular vote.	Plurality.	Majority.	Minority.
1828	Andrew Jackson	647,231	138,134	138,134	.....
"	J. Q. Adams	509,097	.....	.....	.....
1832	Andrew Jackson	687,502	157,313	124,305	.....
"	Henry Clay	530,189	.....	.....	.....
1836	Martin Van Buren	761,549	24,893	24,893	.....
"	W. H. Harrison	736,656	.....	.....	.....
1840	W. H. Harrison	1,275,017	146,315	139,256	.....
"	Martin Van Buren	1,128,702	.....	.....	.....
1844	Jas. K. Polk	1,337,243	38,175	.....	24,125
"	Henry Clay	1,299,668	.....	.....	.....
1848	Zachary Taylor	1,360,101	139,557	.....	151,706
"	Lewis Cass	1,220,544	.....	.....	.....
1852	Franklin Pierce	1,601,474	220,896	64,749	.....
"	Winfield Scott	1,380,576	.....	.....	.....
1856	James Buchanan	1,838,169	496,905	.....	377,633
"	Jno. C. Fremont	1,341,264	.....	.....	.....
1860	Abraham Lincoln	1,866,352	491,195	.....	944,149
"	Stephen A. Douglas	1,375,157	.....	.....	.....
1864	Abraham Lincoln	2,216,067	407,342	407,342	.....
"	Geo. B. McClellan	1,808,725	.....	.....	.....
1868	U. S. Grant	3,015,071	305,456	305,456	.....
"	Horatio Seymour	2,709,615	.....	.....	.....
1872	U. S. Grant	3,597,070	762,991	627,975	.....
"	Horace Greeley	2,834,079	.....	.....	.....
1876	S. J. Tilden	4,284,885	250,935	157,037	.....
"	R. B. Hayes	4,033,950	.....	.....	.....
1880	J. A. Garfield	4,449,053	7,018	.....	311,300
"	W. S. Hancock	4,442,035	.....	.....	.....
1884	G. Cleveland	4,911,017	62,683	.....	222,951
"	J. G. Blaine	4,848,334	.....	.....	.....
1888	G. Cleveland	5,538,233	98,017	.....	300,394
"	Benj. Harrison	5,440,216	.....	.....	.....
1892	G. Cleveland	5,556,918	380,810	.....	945,515
"	B. Harrison	5,176,108	.....	.....	.....
1896	W. McKinley	7,065,410	725,448	380,059	.....
"	W. J. Bryan	6,339,962	.....	.....	.....

It will be observed from this table, which is made up of official returns in all except two or three of the smaller States, that McKinley received the largest plurality and the largest majority over all ever given to a President except in 1872, when Grant defeated Greeley.

It must be remembered that in the latter case the Republican vote of the South was still polled, and that the Democratic vote

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did not come out. The Democratic voters abandoned their candidate, so that that election is hardly a fair test, as it was not at the end seriously contested.

The magnitude of McKinley's victory is thus shown, and it is thrown into still stronger relief if we consider the number of Presidents who have been in a minority of the popular vote, and especially when we recall that Abraham Lincoln in 1860 and Cleveland in 1892 were in a minority of nearly a million, and yet we know how decisive both those elections were at the time.

I now give a series of tables showing the illiteracy, wealth, population, and proportion of foreign-born population in the States voting for McKinley and Bryan.

TABLE II.

PERCENTAGE OF ILLITERACY AND OF FOREIGN BORN, AND WEALTH AND POPULATION OF M'KINLEY STATES.

State.	Percentage of illiteracy.	Percentage of foreign born.	Population.	Wealth.
California	7.7	50.21	1,220,000	$2,533,733,627
Connecticut	5.3	34.99	800,000	835,120,219
Delaware	14.3	12 94	179,700	175,678,795
Illinois	5.2	36.39	4,500,000	5,066,751,719
Indiana	6.3	12.33	3,135,360	2,095,176,626
Iowa	3.6	29.92	2,000,000	2,287,348,333
Kentucky	21.6	6.61	2,200,000	1,172,232,313
Maine	5.5	15.14	732,000	489,134,128
Maryland	15.7	15.73	1,138,348	1,085,473,048
Massachusetts	6.2	38.66	2,495,345	2,803,645,447
Michigan	5 9	40.22	2,297,000	2,095,016,272
Minnesota	6.0	58.85	1,610,000	1,691,851.927
New Hampshire	6.8	22.05	400,000	325,128.740
New Jersey	6.5	35.08	1,672,942	1,445,285,114
New York	5.5	38.73	6,690,842	8,576,701,991
North Dakota	6.0	64 89	225,000	337,006,506
Ohio	5.2	21.53	4,000,000	3,951,382,384
Oregon	4.1	33.48	400,000	590,396,194
Pennsylvania	6.8	27.19	5,760,128	6,190,746.550
Rhode Island	9.8	40.18	384,758	504,162,352
Vermont	6.7	19.36	340,000	265,567,323
West Virginia	14.4	5.40	875,000	438,954,881
Wisconsin	6.7	52.93	1,937,915	1,833,308,523
23 States	Av., 7.90	Av., 30.99	Total, 44,994,338	Total, $46,789,803,012

The statistics on population are estimates made from the *World Almanac* by the Governors of the States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERCENTAGE OF ILLITERACY AND OF FOREIGN BORN, AND WEALTH AND POPULATION OF BRYAN STATES.

State.	Percentage of illiteracy.	Percentage of foreign born.	Population.	Wealth.
Alabama	41.0	2.50	1,600,000	$622,773,504
Arkansas	26.6	3.20	1,600,000	455,147,422
Colorado	5 2	30.52	450,000	1,145,712,267
Florida	27.8	11.70	485,000	389,489,388
Georgia	39.8	1.75	1,984,939	852,409,449
Idaho	5.1	37.17	130,000	207,896,591
Kansas	4.0	19.07	1,350,000	1,799,343,501
Louisiana	45 8	10.12	1,225,000	495,301,597
Mississippi	40.0	1.86	1,351,850	454,242,688
Missouri	9.1	17.11	3,200,000	2,397,902,945
Montana	5.5	45 82	185,000	453,135,209
Nebraska	3.1	31.80	1,158,000	1,275,685,514
Nevada	12.8	51.41	60,000	.....
North Carolina	35.7	0.61	1,720,000	584,148,999
South Carolina	45.0	1.45	1,375,000	400,911,303
South Dakota	4.2	44 35	332,000	425,141,299
Tennessee	26.6	2 74	1,800,000	887,956,143
Texas	19.7	14.04	2,838,263	2,105,576,766
Utah	5.6	45.02	254,743	349,411,234
Virginia	30.2	2.99	1,750,000	862,318,070
Washington	4.3	39.44	415,000	760,698,726
Wyoming	3.7	33.99	100,000	169,773,710
	Av., 20.03	Av., 20.39	Total, 25,364,795	Total, $17,094,976,325

The statistics on population are estimates made from the *World Almanac* by the Governors of the States.

Population of McKinley States	44,994,338
" " Bryan "	25,364,795
Balance in favor of McKinley	19,629,543
Wealth of McKinley States	$46,789,803,012
" " Bryan " (excluding Nevada)	17,094,976,325
Balance in favor of McKinley	$29,694,826,687

FOREIGN PARENTAGE.

No percentage by States of persons born of foreign parentage, but in 1890 the number was 20,676,046, being 33.02 per cent. of the population. The percentage in 1880 was 29.75, and in 1870 was 28.25. Total number of foreign born and born of foreign parentage, 29,925,593. Total number of native born and born of native parentage, 32,696,657.

These tables suggest some important and interesting deductions. They show that where the McKinley vote cast against the revolutionary programme was heaviest was in the States where the average of illiteracy was lowest. In other words, they demonstrate that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the public schools not only teach people how to vote intelligently, but also rightly, on fundamental questions and imbue them with the strongest American sentiment. The second table gives also the wealth and population of the various States arranged according to their electoral votes. By them it appears that the population of the McKinley States, in round numbers, was close to forty-five million, while the population of the Bryan States is only a little over twenty-five million.

We find also from these tables that the wealth of the States which gave their electoral votes to the Republican candidate, according to the census of 1890, was close to forty-seven billion, while that of the States which gave their votes to the Democratic candidate was, according to the same census, just over seventeen billion.

The figures giving the percentage of foreign born show that that percentage was largest in the McKinley States. This indicates, in the first place, that a majority of the foreign-born citizens take a conservative view of the currency question. But it indicates something which is more important than this with reference to that which I have said was the main point decided at the election.

The great bulk of the electoral vote of Mr. Bryan came from the Southern States. The voters of those States are chiefly small planters and farmers. It is neither an industrial region nor one of large cities.

Now the planter and the farmer are freeholders and a small freeholder is by nature, and at bottom he can never be otherwise than, conservative; that is, the owner of land whether large or small is not a man who is in favor of the destruction or division of property or of anarchy or disorder. If the issue should be squarely made, he would be found in opposition to the destructive principles of Altgeld and those whom he represented. The Southern planter and farmer, of course, found himself in combination with these elements of the great Northern States merely because he was carried away by the free-silver propaganda. The same is true of the farmers of the West who voted for Bryan. They were for free silver. In a vague way they may have been opposed to railroads and corporations, but they had and can have no genuine sympathy with the general overturn of laws and institutions which the Chicago platform proposed. It is clear also

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that if those disintegrating and revolutionary principles were to find strength anywhere, they would be likely to find it among our foreign-born citizens, because the Altgeld policies were imported and not native. Yet the votes of the States show that the majority of our foreign-born citizens voted decisively against the revolutionary sentiments of the Chicago platform. If those doctrines can be beaten in our great cities, if the majority of the foreign-born citizens are as strongly against them as the native-born, they are not likely to flourish anywhere. They certainly can take no hold among the farmers, planters, and freeholders of the South and West.

This analysis shows, too, how unreal the combination was which enabled Bryan to get as many votes as he did, and that it was made up of men who, in their deepest convictions, were as wide apart as the poles, but who in a period of agitation and bad times were united by the skill of certain desperate leaders on a single misleading issue relating to the currency.

The next and last table which I shall give shows the dates at which the various States were admitted to the Union, and the candidate to whom they gave their electoral vote in the November election.

TABLE III.

AGE OF STATES VOTING FOR MCKINLEY.

State.	Year admitted.	Age.
Delaware	1787	110 years
Pennsylvania	1787	110 "
New Jersey	1787	110 "
Connecticut	1788	109 "
Massachusetts	1788	109 "
Maryland	1788	109 "
New Hampshire	1788	109 "
New York	1788	109 "
Rhode Island	1790	107 "
Vermont	1791	106 "
Kentucky	1792	105 "
Ohio	1802	95 "
Indiana	1816	81 "
Illinois	1818	79 "
Maine	1820	77 "
Michigan	1837	60 "
Iowa	1846	51 "
Wisconsin	1848	49 "
California	1850	47 "
Minnesota	1858	39 "
Oregon	1859	38 "
West Virginia	1863	34 "
North Dakota	1889	8 "

Average age of McKinley States, 80.4 years.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AGE OF STATES VOTING FOR BRYAN.

State.	Year admitted.	Age.
Georgia	1788	109 years
South Carolina	1788	109 "
Virginia	1788	109 "
North Carolina	1789	108 "
Tennessee	1796	101 "
Louisiana	1812	85 "
Mississippi	1817	80 "
Alabama	1819	78 "
Missouri	1821	76 "
Arkansas	1836	61 "
Florida	1845	52 "
Texas	1845	52 "
Kansas	1861	36 "
Nevada	1864	33 "
Nebraska	1867	30 "
Colorado	1876	21 "
South Dakota	1889	8 "
Montana	1889	8 "
Washington	1889	8 "
Idaho	1890	7 "
Wyoming	1890	7 "
Utah	1895	2 "

Average age of Bryan States, 53.6 years

This table, when we consider it, is a very interesting one. It shows that McKinley carried nine of the thirteen original States, and of the other four North Carolina was so divided that its vote has little significance. Going beyond the borders of the thirteen original States, we find that, outside the South, where the voters were held in line merely by party discipline and the strength of the party label, McKinley carried the States just about in proportion to their age as States. From this we see that the older and more settled our States become, the heavier and more decisive is their verdict against dishonest policies and disorganizing and revolutionary principles of government.

If we sum up the whole matter, as disclosed by these tables, we find that the oldest and thriftiest, the richest, the best-educated and the most populous communities in the United States were those where the theories of Altgeld met with their heaviest defeat, going down in some cases under majorities that were little short of phenomenal. It would not be easy to find a better proof of the strong and patriotic character of the American people, or a better guarantee of American institutions than this.

Then again, if we analyze the Bryan vote, we find that his Western States and his Southern States were held to him by the free-silver doctrine, in the one case because it seemed to promise benefit to a local industry, in the other because the old and re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

current delusion, as old as human history, that times can be made better by an abundance of cheap money, had taken hold of the people. It is mere conjecture to say how much of the large vote he received was held to him by the fact that he was the regular candidate of the Democratic party. In New England I have no question that nine-tenths of his vote at least was merely for the label—that is, it came from men who would have voted the Democratic ticket last November if it had declared in favor of gold or if it had declared in favor of putty dollars. On the naked question without the forces of the party organization behind it, Mr. Bryan on the platform which Mr. Altgeld prepared for him would hardly have polled in New England a vote sufficient to have risen above the dignity of the scattering. What I feel certain is true of New England I believe to be true of the rest of the country. Therefore we may not only feel encouraged by the result of the election, but we are warranted in believing more firmly than ever in the character and intelligence of the American people when a great moral issue is squarely presented to them.

I should not for a moment deny, despite the confident view which I think an intelligent study of the statistics warrants, that there were some deplorable and alarming events in the last campaign, but I do not find them in the results of the voting. The great misfortune of the campaign was the capture of the Democratic party, one of the two great parties of the country, by the men who seized upon its name and authority in Chicago. In two strong, well-organized parties lies one of the sources of the success and strength of representative government among the English-speaking people. Great parties are responsible organizations. In the end they are conservative, and tend to maintain the principles on which the government has been founded, and by which the race has prospered. They constitute one of our great points of superiority to the Latin races, who, in their representative governments, do not have two great parties, one of government and one of opposition, but only a collection of groups and factions. From this fact has arisen a large proportion of the troubles which have beset the non-English speaking races in their efforts to carry on representative government. Hence it is that the capture of a great party organization by such elements as prevailed at Chicago is a national misfortune. We have but to look at the next Senate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to see as one of these results that the Republican party is not confronted by a coherent opposition, but by a body of Senators split up into no less than four groups. This is a danger, and every patriotic man must hope that the Democratic party will shake off the unnatural and incompetent leadership into whose hands it has fallen and to return to its old principles under which it has flourished for so long.

The other unfortunate event was the fact that the Southern leaders succeeded again in dragging most of their States into a position where a majority of the people of the country identify them with a revolutionary movement and with hostility to the business and prosperity of the nation. The South has suffered heavily and paid bitterly for bad leadership and mistaken policies in the past. No matter on which side of politics they array themselves it is profoundly to be hoped that the new and progressive elements in the Southern States will lift them out of the false position into which the old leadership has been continually thrusting them.

Yet with all allowances for these two very serious aspects, the result of the election looked at dispassionately cannot but give an American an increased pride in the good sense and high character of his countrymen. We have been brought to a test nearly, if not quite, as momentous as the Civil War and far more insidious. We have met it victoriously and we may well feel confident in the future of such a people and such a country and bend all our energies to the development and renewal of that prosperity before which the last traces of the late campaign, to which hard times alone gave vitality, will melt away.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GERMAN PRESS AND THE UNITED STATES.

BY POULTNEY BIGELOW.

It is one of the curiosities of history that Bismarck should, in some parts of Germany, be regarded as the champion of Constitutional Government as opposed to Absolute Monarchy. The Iron Chancellor is well named in that he has made himself and his country great by means of war and its iron methods. Down in the bottom of his heart he has a profound contempt for popular government of every kind, and he has never shrunk from expressing his feelings on this subject, at least when he was in power. To the representatives of the people assembled in the Imperial Parliament, he more than once hinted that if they refused to vote according to his wishes he would find means of asserting the power of the crown in spite of their opposition. And while on the one hand he is praised as the author of German Constitutional Government, on the other hand he, more than any other German, has exerted himself to make parliamentary government in the Fatherland a worthless institution.

As Bismarck endeavored to rob the people's representatives of their legislative dignity, much more did he attempt to weaken the force of public opinion as voiced by the newspapers. He was wont to refer to them as merely so much ink and paper, and in this spirit his government treated editors as though they could be but of two classes—either slaves or enemies. The constitution of the empire guaranteed a free press along with free speech, and the judges in Prussia are as a class high-minded and able officers. But in spite of all this constitutional machinery the history of journalism in Germany since 1871 is one calculated to depress rather than cheer the student of politics.

In 1866 the King of Hanover was driven from his throne and his estate was sequestered by the Prussian government on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ground that it was necessary to have at the command of the Prime Minister a large amount of money with which to counteract the treasonable machinations of the anti-Prussian Germans. This great fund was a species of secret service money devoted to a variety of objects connected with the political police. As Socialism became a force the money of this fund was used in hiring spies to give information regarding the doings of the disaffected; and much of this money went for the purpose of supporting newspapers devoted to the principles of Bismarck.

It would be grossly unfair to say that the press of Germany is corrupt, unless we refer to a corruption represented in the English and American press as well. Every newspaper is primarily a money-making business and no great daily could long exist if it disregarded the interests of its advertisers or ceased to pay dividends to the shareholders. The editor of a newspaper with us is nominally a free man, but practically he has no more freedom than a member of Congress or a clergyman. He represents a certain line of thought on certain subjects, and woe to the editor who hopes to keep in his place without the sympathy of his proprietor! The newspapers of Germany stand on a far higher level than those of France, for a variety of reasons. In Paris I once heard the ambassador of a great power state deliberately that he could print any article he chose in any paper of Paris provided he paid their regular rates. The statement was so astounding that I asked him seriously whether he meant what he said, whereupon he repeated this damning proposition; in other words he accused Parisian journalists of treating their editorial columns as we treat those reserved for advertisements, and at the same time practicing a deception upon their readers. The German, as a rule, is a reading and thinking man; curious in matters of general information and so intelligent that he is not readily imposed upon by his newspaper. If the German government gave perfect freedom to the press and exercised no favoritism toward the papers supporting different parties, it is possible that the Germans would furnish us with the best newspapers of the world; for even to-day a first-class Berlin paper gives its readers as good articles upon literature, art, science, travel, and human progress generally, as any paper of London or New York, but they stop short of perfection because of the political helplessness to which they are condemned by their own government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Suppose you or I desired to start a newspaper, we must have two things besides capital; we must get news and get advertising. In a free country the state knows no distinction of parties, and news of public interest is accessible to all papers in proportion as their editors are enterprising and intelligent. In Germany it is otherwise. I do not know the exact number of Germans directly or indirectly supported by the state, for the statistics on this subject have never yet been published; but a very able politician told me once that I might regard every other voter in Germany as a dependent upon government. In Germany it is the duty of officials to vote in favor of government measures, and in every other respect they are expected to loyally sustain the powers that support them. The editor therefore who wishes to establish a newspaper must be bold indeed if he attempt to make a fortune out of his enterprise while advocating a cause distasteful to the government. Every official will, of course, boycott him and he will be unable to secure advertisements from such as have any relations with the government. When we recall that all the railways of the state; all the eating-houses and drinking-places connected with this system, are indirectly government institutions; that the telegraph and express service are managed by the state; and that the contracts for the army make up a large part of the country's industry, we can readily appreciate the fact that the state has a means of influencing the advertising columns, if not the editorial columns, of many newspapers.

But in the matter of securing news, the position of a German editor is more delicate still. Should he apply to the Foreign Office, or to any other department of the government for an interview with any official, the first question raised is as to the political views encouraged by his paper. Should these views be opposed to those of the officials, our editor will be shown the door with the remark that disloyal papers need not expect assistance from the government which they are seeking to overturn. That editor, should he be so innocent as to have made these two efforts, will soon realize that he must either abandon his project of making an independent newspaper, or else limit himself to the discussion of literary and musical compositions.

It is easy to see that a government with a large fund of money notoriously reserved for press purposes, and reserving to itself

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the power of furnishing news only to subservient papers—that such a government is in a position to create in its service a servile, if not a corrupt, body of newspaper men. This is putting the case very strongly, and standing alone this proposition might strike the German reader as a gross misrepresentation of facts, yet no one more than myself appreciates the excellent work done in journalism by many German newspapers even to-day. I need only point to the *Nation* and the *Vossische* as examples of independent journals fighting persistently for constitutional freedom, and at the same time representing a very respectable minority of their countrymen ; but examples of this kind are too rare and brilliant to affect our general proposition, and the melancholy fact remains that in Germany it is far from complimentary to describe one as a journalist.

Under the laws governing the German press there must be attached to every newspaper some editor engaged with the distinct understanding that he may be called upon at short notice for the purpose of being imprisoned for alleged treasonable utterances in the paper. We do not know what treason is in American law, and no Englishman regards the word as anything but a dead letter in his own. We punish a man, not for his thoughts or for his language, but simply because of an overt act leading directly to a breach of the peace ; for instance, Guiteau was hung, not because he imperilled the head of the state, but because he murdered a private citizen ; but Bismarck has more than once, during his official career, arrested eminent members of Parliament for addressing their constituents in language out of harmony with government propositions. To be sure, Bismarck has been six years out of office, but it is his machinery which still moves the great engine of the German State.

I have said this much about the nature of the German press in order to explain to Americans how it is possible for a government to use it as part of its own machinery; and I have said quite enough, I am sure, to show that this press must attract to itself men ready to sell their opinions on any side of a question.

Now as to the attitude of the German press towards the United States, it is, after all, little more than asking what is the attitude of German military, official and aristocratic classes towards our Republic. The governing class of Germany lives principally by two sources of income ; the one a government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

salary; the other the rent which they draw as landlords. As dependents upon government and as an important part of an absolute monarchy they must look with profound distrust upon a community of 70,000,000 of English-speaking people governing themselves without the intervention of a divinely-anointed War Lord. The American experiment in self-government is a monstrous anomaly and impious scandal to the average German squire. That it will succeed he does not for a moment believe and he is profoundly ignorant of anything American save the large number of discreditable items which abound in the local German papers on the subject of our divorce cases, our lynchings, our strikes, and above all our political dishonesty. The German newspapers make no distinction between citizens of the United States and those of any other part of the Great Western Continent. The American in Germany seeking for news of his country looks under the head-line "America," and there finds items from Brazil, Costa Rica, Chicago, Montreal or Mexico, all put together as though they were near neighbors under the same political head. And, indeed, the German squire or Yunker firmly believes that the United States persists as a Republic, not in spite of corruption, but because of it. He thinks that the President and his cabinet are a species of oligarchy holding power through bribery or intimidation, or both, much after the manner of some little South American republics we might name. He believes that Americans are chronically shrewd and dishonest; that American women are hopelessly emancipated; that society with us is a rotten concern compounded of vulgar millionaires and a proletariate of adventurers. It requires but a casual reading of German papers, notably the provincial ones, to justify all that I have said, but it requires some knowledge of German official machinery to see why it is that these papers take so much pains to paint America and Americans in such unlovely colors.

It is bad enough that we should in German eyes represent principles of government hostile to those of an empire, but in the eyes of a Prussian landlord we commit daily sins more grievous still. We are shipping to Germany bread stuffs, and even meat, to an enormous extent, all of which compete with the wheat and meat grown by loyal Germans. It is bad enough in their eyes that Russia and Hungary, both of them monarchical countries, should compete with the monarchical pigs and cereals of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Fatherland, but it is nothing less than sacrilege that the profits of Prussian landlords should be diminished by importation from such a republic as ours. The German squire would gladly enforce a law excluding all food produce from every country, in order that the people might be forced to pay higher prices for bread, but, fortunately for other countries, there is in Germany a large and intelligent industrial class, who see good reason why they should have cheap food, even if the landlord must receive smaller rents.

Then again Germany cannot forgive our country for attracting every year a large number of young men who are fit for military service. She says, and with some show of justice: "We have given these young men their education at the expense of the state, and now, when they are in position to pay back to the Fatherland the debt they owe, they sail away to a new country and become Americans." The German is unwilling to believe that his fellow-countrymen emigrate to America because they prefer American institutions to those of their own country; on the contrary he is firmly persuaded that we, in some underhand manner, entice good Germans away by means of heavy bounties or fraudulent representations made by government agents. In fact so deeply grounded is the German suspicion regarding things American that they are ready to believe anything about our country, so long as it is not complimentary. For instance, I have not only seen it taken for granted in print, but even heard it stated in conversation by educated Germans, who certainly meant no disrespect to me, that our War of Independence, as well as the Civil War, were won because we had in our ranks so large a number of Germans, or because our men were drilled and commanded by Germans. These absurd propositions are made in such good faith that it is impossible to dispute the matter with a German for fear of wounding his national pride. To him there was but one hero in the war of 1776, namely Steuben; and as for the war of 1860, of course the hero was Franz Siegel.

In January of this year the State of New York sent me to Berlin for the purpose of presenting its ultimatum to the Prussian Government in the matter of its behavior toward our principal life insurance companies. My credentials were of the most complete nature, for they were derived not merely from the Governor of New York, but his authority was further fortified

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the endorsemen of the State Department at Washington, and through it by the American Embassy in Berlin. The case was very simple and my little diplomatic mission still more so. Prussia had felt the competition of our life insurance companies for the reason that we, in America, being able to invest our funds at a higher rate of interest than Prussians, were consequently able to offer those who assured in Germany a higher advantage than could be offered by their own companies who had not the same advantages in the way of investments. But Prussia did not wish to put herself on record as violently excluding American companies, so instead of that she framed a series of police regulations, so artfully drawn that the most important of the American companies found it wiser to withdraw than to attempt to obey an edict which was obviously intended to ruin their Prussian business. I had no other care in this matter than to inform the Prussian Minister of the Interior that if he persisted in treating our insurance companies in this ungenerous manner, the State of New York would be compelled to retaliate. As it had been my good fortune to meet personally in previous years nearly every member of the German or Prussian government, I withheld the retaliatory document until I had had an informal personal talk on the subject with each of them, for I had left New York in the firm belief that the ungenerous Prussian edict would be revoked upon a clearer understanding of the case. Nearly every minister of the government gave me fair words, but in one notable case I discovered that the official opinion in regard to our two or three leading life insurance companies was that they were little better than swindling concerns, and no protestations that I could make was capable of shaking this opinion. But the answer to my proposition came through the German press before the officials had made known their answer. There appeared in one German paper after another a series of paragraphs and articles evidently inspired by government, all of them insulting to the United States in general and to the insurance department of the State of New York in particular. The hue and cry was taken up by all the official, semi-official, and otherwise dependent press, and the statement was boldly made throughout the country that the government was only protecting Germans from the swindling efforts of insecure American insurance companies. The attack

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon America, of course, harmonized with the Bismarckian idea of state protection to native industries, and the press paid no attention to the few journalistic efforts made by one or two independent papers to stem this torrent of abuse let loose by government.

Perhaps this dislike of the government for things American finds nourishment in the fact that a large number of German subjects, who have gone to America and made some money, return to their native land with a great deal of swagger, and pretend to be American citizens, though they can barely speak English, and obviously use the American name for the sake of evading taxation. These white-washed citizens are usually not very creditable to either country, and unfortunately give Germans about the only idea they have of our countrymen.

But let us not think that we are alone the target of German press malevolence. That we are now singled out for particular attention proves only that we have to-day, in the eyes of the German government, more importance than we had when her attacks were only occasional and sporadic. About six years ago Russia was the object of Germany's particular press attacks, because the Czar had built many fortifications on his western frontier, and had placed nearly the whole of his standing army in positions that meant nothing if not a menace towards the West. But Prince Hohenlohe, the present Chancellor of the Empire, has many reasons for desiring to retain the favor of the Czar's government, and consequently the German press has ceased to find much occupation in that quarter. It is England that latterly has received the greatest amount of German abuse, for reasons very vague, indeed, about as vague as those influencing the abuse of America. The German government to-day, not satisfied with having the strongest army in the world, aspires to be a great colonial power. She possesses already one million square miles of feverish soil, situated mostly where no white man cares to live; indeed, on this one million of square miles there are not to-day so many Germans as would fit into one battalion of their army. Mr. Chamberlain has placed this number as low as 700, although in their own White Book on the subject I added up over 900. Now, here again Germans find reason for abusing England, because she draws away from Germany hundreds and thousands of German subjects who might have gone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a German colony, they think, had they not preferred to go to an English one. In this respect England resembles the United States, in that she offers to settlers cheap land and the sweets of constitutional liberty. Germany, however, governs her colonies as she would a barrack yard, or a Polish province, with the result, that in South Africa at least, not even the Boers can be induced to settle under the German flag, much as they admire the German Emperor and dislike Queen Victoria.

Returning recently from a trip through the Transvaal and the Cape Colony, I could not but be struck wherever I went in South Africa by meeting most excellent German settlers, growing rich under a foreign flag, enjoying at least under British rule all the liberty they could possibly desire, but at the same time finding nothing but abusive epithets to apply to England and Englishmen. Naturally I had frequent occasion to ask them why hey did not move into German West Africa or German East Africa, where they would be free from the presence of Englishmen ; but that idea, to them, was so preposterous that they always treated it as a joke. To Germans at home it is most irritating that England should offer better inducements to colonists than does their own government, for, in parenthesis, let us note that the German colonies are a heavy tax upon Germany, while English colonies are self-supporting, to say the least. Were it not for this artificially stimulated zeal for German colonies, it would be impossible to conceive of a people so sensible as the Germans, going mad over tropical possessions which they have held now for twelve years, which are a perpetual drain on the mother country, and which afford occupation to a mere handful of Germans who would probably be materially more prosperous if the English flag were substituted for the German.

The United States, without being a colonial power, has of late emphasized the Monroe doctrine in a manner irritating to the German government. That government is seeking to enlarge its navy, and a navy, as we know, must have coaling stations. That the United States should spread out its hand over the whole of Central America, the West Indies, and South America is well enough, in so far as it protects France and England in their West Indian and South American possessions, but is cold comfort to Germany, which would very much like to have something to say in those waters. It should not surprise us if we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

read some morning the news that the German flag had been hoisted on St. Thomas or Curaçoa as a practical protest to our pretensions. Denmark sold St. Thomas to us some thirty years ago, but our Congress declined to ratify the bargain. Why should not Germany make the purchase? and what if she came to an understanding with Holland in regard to some of her West Indian harbors? We must not suppose that the German government is seeking to spend more money upon its fleet merely for the pleasure of seeing a large number of warships together in Kiel. Her navy can be of little use in an European war as compared with her excellent army, but Germany can do nothing outside of her borders without ships-of-war, and that she is building up her navy can only mean that she intends to participate actively in events beyond the seas. In this last summer she sent her blue-jackets ashore at Zanzibar, and took away under her protection the rebellious Sultan of that country, in spite of English protest. By that act she gave notice to all Mohammedans that Englishmen in that part of the world were of less consequence than Germans. In January of 1896 a German man-of-war at Delagoa Bay attempted to land fifty blue-jackets and march them into the Transvaal to protect the Boers against an alleged act of war on the part of England. The German Emperor, at the same time, let loose a dispatch which was by the Boers interpreted to mean that, in case of need, they might count upon German assistance against England. The Boers are illiterate ranchmen for the most part, and know of the outside world no more than the Mohammedans of Zanzibar. At Pretoria, therefore, the harm done by the Emperor's dispatch consisted in making the Transvaal government to feel that with their handful of cattle-drivers they could cheerfully face all the troops that England might bring against them; and with this confidence, based upon German action, they have gone to great extremes in expressing officially their contempt for English sovereignty.

Of course in regard to both these episodes, the German press almost entirely kept up a steady fire of abusive articles against English selfishness and tyranny quite as violent as any attack ever made upon the United States.

We have to-day fallen still deeper in German eyes in that we have shown a disposition to treat England in a manner creditable to civilized people. We have both officially and in popular

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolutions endorsed the principle that war between England and the United States would be worse than a crime—it would be a monumental blunder. Europe, with its standing armies, chuckled with delight when it seemed possible that England and our country would go to war over Venezuela, for the happiest dream of a Frenchman or a German is the breaking up of the British Empire and a division of spoils amongst the other great Powers, much as Poland was divided a hundred years ago. But that England and America should come out of this quarrel, not only without threats of war, but with an apparent understanding that each regarded such a proceeding as stupid, is a source of deep regret, particularly in the German Cabinet. For there is a converse to the above proposition, namely, that in case America or England be engaged in war with some third Power, not only will neither attack the other, but on the contrary each will observe a species of benevolent neutrality. It is a well-known principle of diplomacy that the art of weakening your opponent is to isolate him first, and then crush him. The jubilation of France springs from the feeling that she has now emerged from this lonesome state, and that, together with Russia, she is more powerful than the members of the Triple Alliance.

With an understanding between England and the United States, no possible combination of European powers can hope with any success to give more than a momentary check to the great onward sweep of the English-speaking, self-governing race.

The German press is only the faithful exponent of the German government in looking malevolently upon the United States while such combinations as these are possible or even mooted on either side of the Atlantic. So long as we were merely an agglomeration of industrial communities without any apparent desire to take an interest in the affairs of the rest of our race, Germany could afford to regard us with no more contempt than she expended upon the Boers of South Africa prior to 1884, but now that we have created a new navy and have insisted upon being heard, not merely in regard to South America but even at the gates of Constantinople, we have placed ourselves in a position to invite jealousy as well as dislike. Our last election made a more profound impression upon Europeans than any event in our history since the separation from England. For the first time German newspapers even treated American politics as a matter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

directly affecting their pockets. So eminent an economist and statesman as Dr. Theodore Barth travelled the United States during the whole of the Presidential canvass and wrote home to his paper, *Die Nation*, a series of discriminating articles on the situation. It was felt in Europe generally, and in England particularly, that government by the people was on trial and that if dishonest coinage should triumph the meaning was clear that the United States, as a popular government, was a failure. Often before has popular government in America been on trial in particular cities, and in individual States, but never has a great national crisis turned upon a question so vitally important to the world at large as whether the national credit and the integrity of the Supreme Court should be maintained. Once more has the cause of popular government gained the victory, and we need not close our eyes to the fact that such a victory means cheer to the hearts of millions on the continent of Europe who looked to the United States for a vindication of democratic principles. Had Bryan been elected every semi-official newspaper in Germany would have rejoiced with a vigor only second to that which they would have experienced had they heard the news that Canada or Australia had become German colonies.

In conclusion let me emphasize, particularly for the benefit of such Germans as may see these lines, that I quite appreciate the distinction between the people of Germany and the government of Germany, but that like the expressions "Prussia" and "Germany" they may often, for purposes of brevity, be confounded.

POULTNEY BIGELOW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STRIKES AS A FACTOR IN PROGRESS.

BY M. E. J. KELLEY.

THE utility, or rather the uselessness, of strikes is a favorite topic of discussion with those whose attention has been called to the extraordinary scale on which these old economic phenomena have recently developed. Whenever, for any reason, workingmen or workingwomen "go on strike" straightway is raised the cry that "wilful waste makes deserved want"; that through their misguided hearkening to the voice of the agitator, they lose wages which no future advance will quite make up. The statistician comes to the front with figures which show just how much the workman is out of pocket by his voluntary idleness, and which prove to the scientist's, if not the workingmen's, satisfaction that, even when the strike is successful from the wage-earners' point of view, the advance in wages is rarely enough to compensate the striker for his loss of earnings, leaving out of consideration the hardships consequent on his idleness.

As comparatively few strikes result in the granting of the workmen's demands, and as the proportion of successful strikes becomes smaller with the more complete organization of employers into associations, leagues, combinations, corporations, and trusts, the questions naturally arise: "Why do working people strike if they know that so little is to be gained? When are strikes beneficial to the workers?"

From the striking workman's point of view, from the vantage ground of the trades-unionist, all strikes are beneficial to the working people whether they succeed or fail.

It is something after this fashion that the trades-unionist thinks and talks about the matter: Most people look at strikes in a much too fore-shortened sort of way. It is like looking at the houses across the street and regarding them as dull walls of brick

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or stone, which shut out our view and our air. When we look beyond the walls we see the homes, and a little thinking convinces us that these houses, with our house and others, go to make up the city. They are the result of the advance of civilization and necessary to its further progress. So it is with strikes. Take a great railroad strike, for instance. People are apt to think of it as hindering them from getting about their affairs. Closer investigation shows that it, too, is a necessary part of civilization. Strikes are checks which prevent civilization from going to smash through the brutalization of the masses. They are like the torpedoes the switchmen place on the tracks to warn the engineer of approaching trains to slow up, for there is danger ahead. Perhaps you have lain awake at night and listened to the low rumble of a heavily-laden freight train coming nearer and nearer. Suddenly you hear two quick sharp reports. The rumble grows fainter, then ceases, and you know the engineer has stopped and got down to consult the man in the switch tower.

And that is just what the engineers of society do. They get down and look about for the trouble. They investigate the motives and methods of employers, and seek for results on their employees. If the explosions are numerous enough they set about finding remedies for the grievances which have led to such persistent alarms.

That is one reason why all strikes are beneficial to working people; because they set people thinking about the conditions of the workers. A strike is always beneficial in the long run because it interests in the dynamic labor movement a great many persons who would never think of conditions, or their relation to civilization generally, if it were not for some violent disturbance. And the more people are interested, the sooner the strike phase of the development of the labor movement will give way to something less violent.

It is this profound conviction that in the long run strikes are a success, even when they fail, which impels clear-headed leaders of organizations to advocate the most determined fighting even when it is apparent to every one that the point contested must inevitably be lost. They believe implicitly that all the improvements which have been brought about in labor's condition, all the factory laws and boards of arbitration and conciliation, bureaus of statistics, are due indirectly to strikes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even when strikes seem most absurd, and look to the casual observer like the most dismal sort of failures, they are often of the greatest benefit. There was the great railroad strike of 1894 at Chicago, which so many condemned, and which to most outsiders looked like a disastrous failure. No trades-unionist looks upon it as anything but a most glorious event in the history of labor insurrections. Eugene Debs, who was sent to prison for violating a sweeping injunction, is thought to have done more for labor's cause than any one person has accomplished since the days of Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison.

The railroad companies were not the first employers to secure injunctions which tied the strikers, who desired to obey their country's laws, hand and foot, and even deprived them of the right of free speech. But never before had the injustice and the evil of such a course been brought so forcibly to the country's notice. The echo of the indignation of the time may be heard in the political platform of one of the old parties in the recent Presidential campaign. The Chicago strike did more to show the people generally the tremendous power of the railroads, and how utterly dependent on them is our economic and social life; it interested more of the educated class, and did more towards making possible the governmental control of the railroads, than a quarter of a century of agitation could have accomplished.

The strike of the six thousand motormen and conductors employed on the trolley cars of Brooklyn may be cited as another example of the strike which seems, from the foreshortened point of view, a disaster, and from the trade-unionists' standpoint, a success. Thousands of people now regard municipal control of public franchises as desirable where a dozen gave the matter a thought before the strike, and this, in the end, must be a benefit to the workers in general because it will mean reduced fares and better service, as well as better treatment for employees. The interest aroused by the strike in the condition of men employed by the street car companies has led to the drafting of a bill which will be presented to the next Legislature, and which provides that all bodies holding public franchises shall establish joint boards of conciliation and arbitration with their employees for the purpose of settling all disputes. Provision is made for the selection of a referee whose decision shall be final in case the members of the board cannot come to an agreement.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The strike of the cigarmakers at Binghamton, N. Y.—a strike which involved three thousand young men and women, which lasted three months and ended in disastrous failure for the workers immediately involved—was a direct benefit to the strikers in Brooklyn five years later. The strike at Binghamton in 1890 was broken up by means of injunctions which restrained the leaders from making addresses to the strikers, from writing articles for the newspapers, from soliciting aid, from picketing shops. The Cigarmakers' Union carried the suits on which the injunctions were based to the higher courts, and four years later a decision was handed down that in New York State workingmen are on the same footing as business men. Their labor is a commodity and they have the same right to persuade others to join with them in protecting their own interests by keeping up the price of the commodity they have for sale that merchants possess. They have the right to persuade others to leave their employers, provided they do not use violence, and they have the right to picket shops. In short, all the methods which a merchant may use to protect his business and to persuade his competitors not to undersell or otherwise injure him are legitimate for the labor seller. While this view of labor as a commodity, like other wares, may not be in accord with the opinions of the most enlightened school of economists, this decision of the highest court of New York, sitting at Syracuse, in the fall of 1894, was of great importance to the Brooklyn strikers. Injunctions could not tie the hands and tongues of the leaders of the motormen as they did the cigarmakers' strike committee. The Binghamton strike was a great success for the working people as a whole, although it was a miserable failure for the cigarmakers involved.

Less easily pointed out are the benefits which result from strikes in the way of prevention of reductions of wages or of the imposition of harder conditions. The greedy employer who will stop at nothing, no matter what its effect upon the workmen, so long as it enables him to undersell his competitors, will hesitate a long time before he will reduce wages if he has had one experience with a long and bitter strike. It is a maxim among the workmen advocates of boards of conciliation and mediation that such boards are never successful until both sides are thoroughly tired of fighting. The employer will only consent to settle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peaceably all future differences after he has been thoroughly whipped, or at any rate made to take a leading part in a long and expensive strike. And it is a fact that the most successful joint boards of conciliation are in operation in those trades which have been characterized by the fiercest fighting. In Belgium and in England the mine owners and their employees only came together to settle matters peaceably after long and bitter strikes. The same thing is true of the building trades in New York, which have not had a strike for twelve years, and all of whose difficulties are now settled by a duly elected joint board in which the Workmen's Union and Employers' Association are equally represented.

More obvious are the benefits of strikes which succeed than the helpfulness of those which fail. Very often, however, their real benefit is overlooked. Usually the increase of wages or the prevention of a reduction is only the surface indication; the real benefit strikes deeper roots into the social body. The strikes of the garment workers are evidence of the superficial view which the great public takes of strikes. Not one person in a hundred of those who have read of the bitter struggle of those half-starved foreigners has any notion of the significance of the struggle. Only the few who have made a study of the sweatshop system have a realizing sense of the good which the garment workers' strike has accomplished not only for the workmen involved, but for every one who ever wears a ready-made garment. If people did understand, the secretary of the Garment Workers' Union would be snowed under the avalanche of letters and resolutions of thanks.

The conditions under which ready-made clothing was manufactured in all the great cities, but particularly in New York, prior to the series of strikes inaugurated three or four years ago, was atrocious. The workshops were merely tenement-rooms, insufficiently ventilated, badly lighted, terribly crowded. Dirty beyond description, and entirely without any decent sanitary arrangements, men, women, and children worked, ate, and slept in them. Very often the only beds were the piles of half-finished clothing. Scarlet fever, diphtheria, and measles were two hundred per cent. more frequent in the sweatshop districts of New York than anywhere else, and children ill of these diseases lay on the heaps of garments which were afterwards taken back to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the retail shops and scattered far and wide. Rarely was any method of disinfecting the garments thought of, or any attempt made to prevent contagion. The hours of labor were outrageous, Children four years old, even, were found pulling basting threads twelve hours a day.

Time and again the public was harrowed by the story. The United States Senate appointed a committee of its members to investigate. It did so and reported itself duly horrified, but no improvement resulted. The Legislature of New York did likewise and the sweatshop system continued to flourish. Anti-sweatshop leagues, composed of philanthropic and influential people, were organized. Apparently no one dreamt that the workers themselves might solve the vexing problem by the very simple method of refusing to work under such conditions. Ignorant of the language and customs of the country, most of them Russian Hebrews, immigrants, they seemed helpless indeed. Gradually the leaven of discontent worked among the New York sweatshop toilers. The immigrant aspired to the level of the native worker. Leaders sprang up from among their ranks. Three years ago they inaugurated a series of strikes. First, they struck against the "task" system, which was at the basis of the terribly long hours. They had been required to finish a certain number of garments as a day's work, instead of working a stipulated number of hours. They were willing to work ten hours a day, they declared. Public sentiment was with them, and they won their strike. Emboldened by success, and by the fact that a law had been passed regulating the manufacture of clothing in tenement-houses, and giving special powers over the sweatshops to the factory inspectors, they struck again. They demanded that the wholesale dealer give the cut garments only to contractors who would have them made up in shops conforming to the factory laws. Their demands were granted, with the result that the sweatshop system, if not entirely wiped out, has received a very severe blow. The workers themselves, by their own united efforts, and by using that much-abused weapon the strike, have accomplished what apparently far more influential outsiders were unable to do. The garment workers all over the country followed the example of their New York brethren of the National Garment Workers' Union, and in most cases succeeded in materially improving conditions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The garment workers' strikes are particularly interesting not only because they show the power of the workers when they realize that power and work together, but because they demonstrate the quickness with which the immigrant rises to the new level instead of dragging down the American workman to his old-world standard. The garment workers' strikes are also illustrative of the change in methods of strikes which has been brought about by changed methods of employers. The later-day strike to be successful must be on an immense scale. The old idea of the workmen was to strike in one shop at a time, but they have been obliged to change their methods since employers have formed combinations and in such a case supply the orders of the shop in which the workmen have struck instead of trying to get the unfortunate employer's customers for themselves, as they would under the old order of competition. The modern strike to have any chance of success must be on a large scale. The workmen must be well organized and disciplined. The chances of winning are increased by having a paid leader whose business it is to devote his whole time to the management of the collective affairs of the workmen.

From the trades-unionist point of view, then, all strikes are beneficial to working people in the long run. Some strikes are beneficial to those who strike as well as to the workers generally. A strike may be a benefit to people who never heard of it. This pre-supposes, of course, a wrong of some sort back of the strike. Strikes which have not a principle of justice behind them are very rare nowadays. In the earlier stages of the labor movement it is quite possible that feverish, childish, ill-considered strikes were entered into without sufficient cause. Mr. Oscar Cole, a prominent member of the New York Bricklayers' Union, and a member of the New York Council of Mediation and Conciliation, remarked recently that twenty years ago, whenever the slightest dispute arose, the bricklayers threw down their trowels, pulled off their overalls and quit. Nowadays they do things quite differently. The bricklayers of New York have not struck in twelve years, yet they are receiving a third more pay and working two hours a day less than before the era of peace set in. Their employers, too, consider themselves better off, though they pay nearly twice the old scale of wages, because of the certainty of not having their contracts delayed by strikes, and because of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

higher grade of intelligence and the greater sense of responsibility which have been developed. But even these benefits may be traced to those early strikes which caused people to inquire into their difficulties, and to suggest a better way of settling disputes. When both sides were tired of the constant fighting they listened to the suggestion of an outsider, Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, that they should organize a joint board of conciliation and arbitration. Both sides are represented, and all disputes are settled by the joint committee. This is one of the greatest benefits of strikes, that they ultimately lead to better ways of settling labor disputes, and there seems no other way of reaching this peace except through war.

The labor movement is simply the struggle upward to the light of the wage-earning class; the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariate, the Socialists call it. All emancipating movements have begun in insurrections. Strikes are the insurrections of labor. There has come, in all emancipating movements, the taking up of the cause by disinterested outsiders. This, too, has happened to labor. It marks the step beyond the strike stage of the labor agitation, and that, too, is one of the benefits of strikes. Strikes mean progress.

M. E. J. KELLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GENIUS IN CHILDREN.

BY ANDREW LANG.

DR. JOHNSON defined genius as "an infinite capacity for taking pains." He remarked, "I am persuaded that had Sir Isaac Newton applied himself to poetry he would have made a very fine epic poem." In short, the Doctor's opinion was that a man, by accident, is born with more mind, with a more powerful mind, than other people, and that the *direction* of this power, to poetry, war, law, mathematics, politics, is quite an affair of chance. But the power must be "applied with diligence."

Now, in my opinion Dr. Johnson was wrong, and I would rather define Genius as "an unmeasured capacity for doing things, *without* taking pains." Moreover, I fancy that, as a rule, the child of genius is born to do but one set of things in this excellent easy way, though there are exceptions, as in Napoleon's case.

Let us take arithmetic, the science of numbers. Dr. Johnson said, "We may instance the science of numbers, which all minds are equally capable of attaining" . . . "Mathematics are a science to which the meanest intellects are equal." . . . "Yet we find a prodigious difference in the powers of different men, in that respect, after they are grown up, because their minds have been more or less exercised in it."

Now, surely both schoolboys and teachers will here disagree with the Doctor. In the power of learning arithmetic there are prodigious, natural differences from the very first. I, myself —this does not illustrate genius !—could not be taught arithmetic at all beyond the simplest rules, and algebra not at all. As to mathematics, Macaulay was absolutely incapable of learning them ; so too, I think, was Sir William Hamilton, the philosopher. Meanwhile, many boys, otherwise stupid, are fair, or even good, mathematicians.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the great argument against the Doctor is furnished by calculating boys. About a score of these prodigies are known in history. At a very early age, say, five or six, they have been able to do in a moment, and correctly, calculations which, with pencil and paper, would occupy mathematicians for a long time. A German schoolmaster once set his class a sum which he expected would suffice for an hour's work. One boy scrawled a line of figures on his slate and threw it down. "There it lies," said he, and his answer was right. Where was the taking of infinite pains?

In this case genius was a capacity for doing things without taking pains at all. As a rule, these calculators have been unable to explain how they did the sums. The answers flashed on them; they *saw* the answers at a glance; they did not know *how*.

Out of about a score of such boys two or three have been almost idiots at everything but calculation. This, of course, again proves the doctor to be wrong! These boys had *not* large quantities of mind in general, of mind fit for all purposes; they only had arithmetical genius, without taking pains.

Two or three of these lads again turned out great philosophers, or great practical men. The rest were on the common level. The strangest was Archbishop Whateley. As a small boy he was a miracle at counting. At about twelve years of age he lost the knack, and, though a very clever man, became almost a dunce in arithmetic; certainly, at least, no better than his neighbors.

Thus Dr. Johnson's chosen exemple, of genius as applied to numbers, is found to confute his opinion. If any reader of this happens to be, or to know, a calculating miracle of a child, may I implore him to study the case, and especially to observe whether the child is left-handed, or can make equally good use of both hands?

The most extraordinary genius would be that which could do anything equally well without taking pains. Of this class the standing example is Joan of Arc. A peasant girl of seventeen, she understood the politics of her day as nobody else understood them. In war, whether for gallantry and resolution as a leader, for skill in artillery practice, for science in military combinations, or for Napoleon-like suddenness in surprises, she excelled all captains of her time. She was an accomplished rider, who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had never learned to ride. When questioned by theologians, she answered with such mastery that they were intellectually powerless in her presence.

Yet she was an untaught peasant child, who could not read nor write. Here, then, was genius, but the only pains she took were pains to make other people carry out her ideas.

In this instance genius conspicuously borders on the miraculous. Indeed, genius always does border on the miraculons. It is intellect and power so different in degree from that of other people that it seems to differ in kind, and to be a sort of "inspiration," or, as we say, "intuition."

Now, the word "intuition" means "seeing," and it will be found that persons of genius do *see* in their mind's eye—see unwritten rows of numbers, hidden pieces on a chess board, the positions of absent armies, the unknown consequences of events, the effects of natural forces as of steam in a kettle, with a clearness unfamiliar to the general body of mankind.

This curious gift of mental, or inner, vision is certainly more common in children than in grown-up people. The creations of their own fancies are more vividly present to little boys and girls than to grown-up people. So far, almost all children are children of genius, and a man of genius is often what he is because he has retained this gift of childhood.

How often children, not destined to be famous, amaze us by wisdom beyond their years! "Out of the mouths of babes" comes a word which the child's own experience, we think, could never have taught him. Has he inherited this genius, as birds inherit, without knowing it, the art of nest-building? Or is it that his eyes are not yet blinded by the dust and smoke of the world?

Next to genius for arithmetic, genius for music is probably the most developed and most surprising in childhood. "He lisps in numbers," like Pope, because there really is a connection between numbers and music.

If we turn to poetry, it becomes far more difficult to recognize early genius. Thousands of boys rhyme from a very early age, thousands of boys who will never be poets. Now the rhymes of the boys who were destined to be poets have usually been no better than the rhymes of boys who were destined to fall back on prose.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The young Mozart was, from the age of four, undeniably a born musician. The young Millais, or Leonardo, or Landseer, or West, was, from early boyhood, undeniably a born painter. But the boyish poems of Scott, Keats, Byron, Shelley, Coleridge, and Tennyson were not a whit better, and were often a good deal worse, than those of boys who were not to be poets at all.

As most children have many of the imaginative qualities of genius, the gift of vivid dreams, and as most children who are to be men of genius display little *special* power—except in music, arithmetic, and drawing—it is not an easy thing for parents to know whether they have a genius in the family or not!

As far as I have studied the childhood of genius, it commonly shows itself less in performance than in *character*, and, alas, not agreeably! The future genius is often violent, ferocious, fond of solitude, disagreeable in society.

The great Du Guesclin, the scourge of the English invaders of France, was a most odious boy. His parents had to make him dine at a table apart. He was rude, furious, a bully; he beat every boy he could lay hands on; he ran away from home; he led companies of peasant children against other companies; he was the terror of the neighborhood, and the ugliest page, as he became "the ugliest knight in France." This was the boyhood of a great military genius; the boyhood it was of a little savage.

Scott's childhood was noisy. He yelled old poems at the top of his voice. He loved the lonely hills. He read forever, when he was not wandering alone, and he remembered everything that he read. He was a dreamer, a teller of romances to himself. He delighted in fighting, as did Keats. He studied everything except his books. His enthusiasm for poetry made a lady recognize him for a genius at the age of six, but his father thought he would end as a strolling fiddler.

Napoleon, again, was sullen, lonely, a dreamer, and always "spoiling for a fight," like Du Guesclin.

Unluckily, sullen, dreamy, pugnacious boys are not at all uncommon. They do not become Scotts (not that *he* was sullen), nor Du Guesclins, nor Napoleons, nor Byrons—for Byron, too, was a passionate, lonely, morbid kind of boy, with terrible fits of temper. His early poems were trash.

Shelley's early poems were trash; Scott's were such as almost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any cleverish schoolboy can write, and there is no promise at all in the Tennysons' "Poems by Two Brothers."

Shelley, indeed, was rather "mad" at school, where he cursed his father and the King, and wrote the silliest of all schoolboy novels. He, also, was dreamy and solitary, but by no manner of means fond of fighting.

In all these cases eccentricity was marked, but whether eccentricity in boyhood can be taken as promise of character and genius is another question. At school in Scotland, a few boys, like "Mad Shelley," were called "dafty." None of them has amazed the world by displaying genius! The great men named were all "dafties" in boyhood, but all "dafties" do not become great men.

Coleridge was a "dafty." "I took no pleasure in boyish sports, but read incessantly." The other boys drove him from among them. He was always a dreamer, and saw so many ghosts that he did not believe in them. "Before I was eight years old I was a *character*," he says—and not an agreeable character! He was vain, lazy, he dreamed, and he despised everybody. He ran away from home, and stayed out all night in the rain. His son, Hartley, was the same child over again, and a metaphysical philosopher from his cradle.

In most of these cases, in addition to mooning, solitary ways, and moody tempers, there was conspicuous *intellect* in the young genius. He could read early and, as it were, untaught, and he did read a great deal. Scott, Byron, Keats, were also athletes and very fond of boxing, of sport, and of games, Byron bowling at cricket for Harrow. *These* geniuses were not such "dafties" as their rivals.

For my part, genius or no genius, I do hate a boy who "shuns boyish sports," as you so often read in biographies. But, on a general survey of genius in childhood, I think that we ought to try to put up with it, and not bully it at school, "at least as far as we are able."

If the genius is a born artist, he is likely to be popular for drawing dogs, horses, and the schoolmaster. If he is going to be a poet—why one rather pities him, in his schooldays. A Scott, a Keats, may make himself respected at school, by a genial readiness to fight all challengers, to take part in every dangerous diversion. A Cowper, or a Shelley, should probably not be sent to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

school at all, and genius rarely passes through the University without what Coleridge calls "a row."

These troubles and sorrows come, because, whatever else genius may be, it is certainly a thing apart, self centred, and ill to govern. A genius "varies from the kindly race of men," hence the tendency, even in childhood, to a love of solitary places, that passion so marked in Wordsworth from his boyhood.

Even in childhood, also, it is a mistake to try to drive genius, a mistake which naturally flows from Dr. Johnson's theory, that the spiritual force can be turned into any chosen direction. Following the Doctor, parents will endeavor to make a boy with a genius for literature take to law or to civil engineering. The effort was made with Mr. R. L. Stevenson, and, of course, failed.

Mr. Stevenson was the only genius whom I ever knew moderately well; in boyhood I did not know him. But he has described, in his own case, the day and night dreams, the love of lonely wanderings, the ungovernableness, the dislike of boyish sports, and the other symptoms of genius in the bud. The *character* was there; the boyish *performances* were not remarkable. You cannot recognize literary genius, in boyhood, "by results." Musical, mathematical, mechanical, and artistic excellence are, for some reason, much more easily recognized, almost from the first.

Perhaps these remarks may console parents of lonely, dreamy, moody, ungovernable sons. Perhaps they may modify the contempt of schoolboys for "dafties." Don't bully such lads; don't thwart them needlessly. They may be children of promise, though the odds, unluckily, are against any future performance.

At all events, do not drive them too hard into uncongenial industries. An instinct wiser than experience may be guiding them into the way appointed. They must and will go their own way. Still, had I a son, who displayed, like Mr. D. D. Home, a genius for being a medium, I certainly should thwart him to the full extent of "the resources of civilization."

ANDREW LANG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PENDING PROBLEMS.

BY THE HON. ALBION W. TOURGÉE.

THREE problems present themselves with which the incoming administration will have to deal without delay, that are unique in our political experience. First, it will have to provide means to meet an actual and serious deficit in revenue which cannot wait for the slow remedy of an uncertain tariff law; second, it must provide some means by which the Treasury will be secured from any special demand for gold that may arise on account of financial conditions either at home or abroad; and, third, it must find some way of relieving our currency from the anomaly of the so-called "silver certificates," which are really promises to pay the holders silver dollars which are worth something less than fifty cents apiece. These three things are tasks of such emergent character that no one professes to believe that they can be avoided or even delayed for any considerable time with safety to our national finances or the interests of the Republican party.

The actual deficit at the date of Mr. McKinley's inauguration will probably amount to $40,000,000, or thereabouts. It is difficult to ascertain its exact amount because of the policy which has been adopted of holding back the payment of appropriations made and the stoppage of work provided for by law, in order to apply the sums which would be required for them to other and more exigent needs. No objection can be made to such a course —it is, in fact, inevitable when an actual deficiency of revenue exists; but it is admitted that the deficiency now amounts to about $36,000,000, and there is no probability of its being reduced in the interim between the present and the fourth of March next. On the contrary, it is almost certain to be increased. Two remedies have been proposed for this condition of affairs:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The one is the passage of the tariff measure now pending before the Senate, known as the Dingley bill, by the present session of Congress, in order to save the delay and the tendency to hasty and incomplete tariff legislation at a special session. As a remedy for the present deficiency, this plan is wholly defective. The Dingley bill at the best could only stop the increase of the deficiency and would of necessity leave the existing deficit unprovided for. The other plan consists merely of leaving the whole matter to be provided for in a tariff law to be enacted at a special session. This view is objectionable to those who realize the necessity of retaining the support of the gold Democrats and understand that this would naturally be imperilled by hasty and extreme action in regard to the tariff.

A similar difficulty presents itself in connection with the currency. No one questions the fact that the present situation is intolerable. In effect, the government is likely to be called upon at any time to pay gold for all the United States notes and all the coin treasury-notes, that may be outstanding at any particular time. These amount to about $480,000,000, or more than four times the gold reserve. Of course, any considerable rise in the price of gold, resulting either from commercial conditions in this country or political conditions abroad which might increase the rate of exchange, would at once cause a repetition of the process by which the gold reserve in the Treasury was lately reduced perilously near the vanishing point and the bonded debt increased $262,000,000 to prevent such result. While it is true that a part of the gold received through the sale of bonds was undoubtedly used to make good a deficiency of revenue, it was made evident to every thinking man that no financial skill can keep gold in the Treasury while the demand-notes of the government remain in circulation, and while for any reason whatever people happen to prefer gold to such notes. Under present conditions, greenbacks and treasury-notes are sure to be presented for redemption, whenever gold is worth a premium, either for domestic use or for export; and there being no legal means of replenishing the gold in the Treasury except by borrowing, new loans must be made and new bonds issued. Everyone is agreed that the government should not be left exposed to such a contingency a moment longer than is absolutely necessary to enact preventive measures.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But just here the question arises, how can such a contingency be prevented? The answer is evident to a child's comprehension. The means by which such result is likely to be effected must be destroyed. What is the instrument by which the gold is likely at any time to be drawn from the Treasury? The demand notes of the government—the legal-tender promises to pay which if the government does not redeem on presentation, the currency of the country must at once depreciate. The Treasury cannot pay $480,000,000 of demand notes, with $110,000,000 gold reserve, any more than an individual can pay four dollars of debt with one dollar of money. It must either borrow to meet the demand or put its indebtedness in some form so that no more can be demanded at any particular time than it is able to provide gold to meet.

To effect this two plans have been proposed; first, that the indebtedness represented by the present demand-notes of the government be placed in the form of long-time bonds, and these be taken by associations which shall deposit them as security for an equivalent amount of bank currency, thus more than trebling the volume of our present national-bank issues. To this plan, there are many and evident objections. (1.) It would greatly and dangerously reduce the volume of our legal-tender currency, so that in case of a commercial panic the only debt-paying currency would be gold and our depreciated silver coins. (2.) In such case, the banks being forced into liquidation as they are likely to be at any time, the government would be compelled to redeem their issues. In other words, the country would be furnishing the capital, and paying the banks a permanent bonus of $12,000,000 a year, at least, for doing what it might do directly and much more securely for a third of that sum, and at the same time be compelled to provide for maintaining the credit of these issues as well as of its bonds. (3.) It would be extremely hazardous for the Republican party, after having denounced the present administration for borrowing money to protect the gold reserve, to increase the interest account to such an extent at the outset, and at the same time restrict the volume of legal-tender currency to a like extent. To do so would in effect be to plead guilty to one of the most serious charges made against it in the late campaign, to wit, a purpose to restrict the debt-paying money of the country to gold coin, in the interest of the dealers in currency and speculators in gold.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still more objectionable would it be, if in apparent imitation of other countries, these bank issues should be made legal tenders. In England, France, and indeed most European countries, the issues of the bank which is the final agent of the government are legal tenders. But in those cases, the bank is, in effect, a part of the government, controls its funds, pays its debts and both maintains and uses its credit. Such conditions are impossible under our system. When the conflict came between Andrew Jackson and the Bank of the United States, the American people settled forever the question of relation between the nation and its banking institutions. The party which should attempt to grant to any bank or system of banks the monopoly of legal-tender issues based on the credit of the government, would to a moral certainty proclaim, thereby, its own death-warrant. The recent "campaign of education" has prepared the people for the intelligent consideration of this question and they will not accept the extension of the costly and unreliable bond-security banking system as a substitute for our present paper currency, unsatisfactory as that may be. Neither is there any probability that they will consent to the restriction of the legal-tender money by fully one-half its present volume, nor allow mere credit banks to issue legal-tender notes.

The question then arises whether there is any other feasible method of preventing the legal-tender notes of the government from being used in any financial emergency to draw gold from the Treasury to the peril of the nation's credit. In an article published in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for October, 1896, the writer suggested another plan which has been very favorably considered by leading financiers, as well as by many other thoughtful persons in all parts of the country. The same was treated especially in its relation to the silver controversy at some length in a contemporaneous work, "The War of the Standards." The controversy which has arisen since the election and the momentous character of the problems affecting our currency which will confront the incoming administration, make it proper that the same should be considered somewhat more fully in relation to assured facts than it could be at that time when such conditions were hypothetical rather than actual.

The distinctive features of the proposed plan consist of: (1.) The substitution of *terminal* legal-tender notes of the govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment for the present *demand* legal-tender notes, and, if found desirable, the silver-certificates also. These notes for convenience are designated *bond*-notes. (2.) The payment of interest at the rate of 1 per cent. per annum on the present non-interest-bearing debt of the United States. (3.) The restriction of the term of the proposed bond-notes to five years, in order that the accrued interest may never exceed 5 per cent.

By this plan, such bond-notes would be at all times worth *as much as gold;* at the end of three years they would be worth 2½ per cent. a year as an investment, and at the end of the fourth year they would be worth 5 per cent.; but they could never go any higher, and only one-fifth of the whole amount would command this rate at any particular time.

Our present demand-note circulation consists, approximately, of United States notes (greenbacks) $346,000,000; coin treasury-notes $140,000,000—$486,000,000. To this, should be added the silver certificates, $340,000,000 more, which are really promises of the government to pay a dollar, though the medium in which such promise is technically redeemable is now depreciated to about one-half the value of the present standard gold dollar. The defect of these certificates is that they are neither demandable in gold nor redeemable in silver. No one can ask that they be paid in gold and no one is willing to receive silver in exchange for them. They hang like Mahomet's coffin midway between the heavens and the earth, sustained as a circulating medium only by the hope that the greatest debt-paying nation of the world will find some way to make them equivalent with the existing gold standard. In effect, they are simply promises to pay and are obnoxious, in a peculiar sense, to the objection of being an irredeemable paper currency, mere fiat money which constitutes a permanent forced loan. This makes the actual amount of our paper currency now issued by the government and representing its non-interest-bearing indebtedness, about $825,000,000, of which somewhat more than two-thirds is legal-tender money redeemable in gold on demand.

In addition to this, we have something like $230,000,000 of national bank-note currency, which is based solely on the credit of the government, being secured by bonds drawing on an average four per cent. interest, and having no other basis of credit whatever. This makes the whole amount of our currency which rests upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the credit of the government about one billion dollars. Of this, practically one-half depends for its stability on the implied promise of the government to redeem it in gold as often as it may be presented: one-fourth of it on the promise of the government to redeem the bank-notes whenever the banks fail to pay the same on presentation, and the other one-fourth on the belief that the nation's promise to pay a depreciated silver dollar will somehow be made equivalent to a good dollar. In order to keep the $500,000,000 demand-notes at par we have maintained a gold reserve, averaging $130,000,000, lying idle in the Treasury for twenty years. In order to keep the national bank-notes at par we pay four per cent. a year on about $250,000,000 of bonds deposited to secure circulation. The $130,000,000 of gold reserve has been proven insufficient to keep the existing amount of demand-notes safely in circulation. To do so would probably require a gold reserve of at least $150,000,000.

We have, then, this evident comparison of cost, between the three methods: To provide $500,000,000 of legal-tender *bond-note* currency to take the place of the present legal-tender *demand* notes, under the proposed plan at one per cent. a year, would cost exactly $5,000,000 annually. The cost of $150,000,000 gold reserve necessary to maintain the present amount of demand-notes in circulation, at four per cent. a year, would be $6,000,000 annually; a balance of $1,000,000 a year in favor of the proposed terminal note currency, or $30,000,000 in thirty years.

The cost of bonds to retire this $500,000,000 of demand-note currency would be not less than three per cent. a year on notes having thirty years to run. This would amount to $15,000,000 a year, or in thirty years $450,000,000 for interest alone. This shows a balance in favor of the proposed bond-note currency of $10,000,000 a year, or $300,000,000 during the life-time of the bonds. In other words, the proposed interest-bearing legal-tender currency will cost the country only five-sixths the amount necessary to keep the present demand-notes in circulation and only one-third as much as will be required to substitute bank-notes for the same.

But this is not all.

These *bond*-notes being divided into classes would make one-fifth of the whole renewable each year, with five years' interest on the same to be paid in gold. This would be equal to one per cent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the whole amount of the proposed currency and would represent the entire amount of gold that could be called for during any year in order to maintain such currency. It would, therefore, be entirely unnecessary to maintain a gold-reserve greater than the amount required to meet the possible liability of any fiscal year. If the whole amount of such bond-note currency were one billion dollars, the yearly payment would be $10,000,000, and it would be unnecessary to retain more than that amount as a gold-reserve to maintain the same. All the rest of the present gold-reserve would be at once available and might be used to meet the current expenses of the government, thus liquidating the present deficit and providing ample funds to run the government until a carefully prepared tariff law could be put in operation, giving sufficient revenue, yet so adjusted as not to be burdensome to the business of the country.

It was not intended, at the time the article referred to was prepared, to make this currency a substitute for the national-bank issues. A recent interview put forth by the Hon. Joseph H. Walker, Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House of Representatives, in which he states with peculiar force the objections to the present national banking system, has induced the inquiry whether the proposed bond-notes may not with advantage to all parties be substituted for that currency, the change being left optional with the banks themselves, which now make complaint that the issue of currency under present conditions is not profitable to them.

Considering this plan, therefore, as applied to the whole of our paper currency, amounting to one billion dollars, its entire cost at one per cent. would be $10,000,000 a year, which is *exactly the cost of one-fourth that amount of national-bank currency based, as it now is, on four per cent. bonds, even if issued to the face value of the bonds held to secure it.* This comparison of cost would remain, even if the currency were supplied by a system of credit banks, because the interest on the bonds would be the same whether they were deposited to secure circulation or not.

The chief advantages resulting from this course are, however, to be found in the following facts: (1.) It would eliminate all currency not of a legal-tender character from our circulating medium. (2.) It would leave to silver coin the whole field of small currency, under $5, that is, in accord with the experience

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of other nations, and so find use for the silver coins now in the Treasury. (3.) It would be easy to keep every part of such currency on a parity with every other part. The bond-notes, being payable in gold with interest in gold, would always be at par, since the payment of interest and the credit of the government would make them as good as its other bonds. The silver coinage being relieved from the burden of doubt created by the silver certificates, would, as a restricted currency regulated by a natural demand, be maintained at parity without difficulty or danger. (4.) It would be a gold-standard currency which would require less gold to maintain it by at least three-fourths than the present demand-notes of only half its volume. It is evident, therefore, that the national banks may, in this manner, be not only safely, but very profitably, relieved of the function which they aver to be so unprofitable, and which Mr. Walker declares increases the rates of loans and discounts throughout the country by making it so difficult for them to pay a profit on their capital. Considering the hardship which the issue of currency seems to impose on these institutions, this should be regarded as a conclusive argument in favor of the plan proposed.

Again, the plan as outlined in the article referred to, contemplates the payment of that part of the public debt represented by its present non-interest bearing promises to pay, in equal instalments covering a period of fifty years, or at the rate of $20,000,000 a year. Even with this provision, the whole amount that could be drawn from the Treasury each year would be $30,000,000. So that more than $70,000,000 of the present gold reserve might be at once released and applied to the current expense of the government, a sum nearly double the existing deficit. This is a consideration of prime importance at this time, not only to the incoming administration but also to the financial conditions of the country. The elimination of the deficit would of itself be a fact that would strengthen the forces of good government, sound money and prosperity to an almost inconceivable degree; and this, taken in connection with the utter destruction of the celebrated "endless chain," would do more than anything else to restore confidence in our financial prospect.

Perhaps the most important feature of this plan, however, is the fact that it provides for an immediate increase of the legal-tender currency instead of a great and dangerous restriction of it. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one really serious claim of the advocates of a double standard is that there is not gold enough in the world to serve the purpose of redemption money. The experience of the world goes to sustain this claim. Every gold-standard country has been compelled to resort to legal-tender paper currency in order to lessen the demand for gold, and the proportion of such legal-tender money to the gold reserves of such countries has steadily increased since 1832, when the legal-tender quality was first conferred upon the issues of the Bank of England. The result is that gold is demandable in payment of debts nowhere in the British Isles except at the Bank of England. Her notes are legal-tender for all debts and all other banks clear in them and hold them as reserves. As a consequence, a much less amount of the money of ultimate redemption is required.

The bond-note provided for in this plan goes a step farther in the same direction; that is, it reduces the amount of redemption money required to hold stable a specific amount of paper currency. In order to keep stable a constantly redeemable currency of one billion dollars, there would need to be a gold reserve always available of at least $300,000,000. This amount would have to be kept practically useless and withdrawn from actual circulation in order to forestall a possible contingency. By applying the principle of terminal redeemability to legal-tender paper currency, this vast reserve of idle redemption money becomes unnecessary, and it is left free to serve its legitimate function in the liquidation of international balances. Even upon a liquidation schedule of fifty years, thirty million dollars a year of gold would be all that would be required to keep a billion dollars of legal-tender bond-notes always at par with gold. Why? Simply because that amount would suffice to meet the stipulation of payment and liquidate the pledge of interest. This would be equivalent to a constant enhancement of the currency of $250,000,000; that is, this sum in gold would be released from service as a reserve necessary to keep the rest of the currency good.

While such currency would always be worth as much as gold, so long as the credit of the government remained good—and whenever that shall fail bank-issues based on bonds and those based on the credit of her citizens will likewise depreciate—and would during a part of the lifetime of every such bond-note be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worth *more* than gold, this period would not be so great as to produce any harmful constriction of the currency if, indeed, it had any such result. The term of these notes being five years, one-fifth being renewable each year with accrued interest, no one would care to invest in them until the close of the third year, so long as money was worth three per cent., while during the fifth year every person would be anxious to secure them in order to get the accrued five per cent. at the end of that year. This would bring gold into circulation to pay for them. In other words, one-fifth of these legal-tender bond-notes would be regularly hoarded instead of gold, which would thereby be released to perform the functions of currency.

The fact should not be forgotten that this plan provides a financial harbor of refuge for the ship of state which is at once easy of access, perfectly secure and easy to leave, whatever way the wind may blow. In no event can the country receive any detriment by its adoption. Viewed in the most unfavorable aspect, it would be merely a funding of one billion dollars of debt at one per cent.; surely not an unprofitable transaction, in itself. If at any time it should appear desirable, this could easily be refunded on the terms proposed as essential to the establishment of either a credit banking system, or one based on the deposit of bonds to secure circulation, since one per cent. bonds can always be exchanged for three or four per cent. bonds without sacrifice. Being renewable every five years they could be called in one-fifth each year, and such disposition made of them as might seem desirable, without shock to our financial system. The ease with which this system may be adopted should also not be left unconsidered. The Secretary of the Treasury has only to be authorized to issue interest-bearing bond-notes for non-interest-bearing promises to pay. Of course, every holder of the latter will be glad to make such exchange. The result will be to give us immediately a currency composed of gold coins, the silver coins now in circulation, and paper currency, every dollar of which will be legal tender, and every dollar of which will be and remain at par with gold, without any legislation or any bracing influence whatever. Even if any other plan should ultimately be adopted, this offers the best and simplest method for effecting the transition. It leaves the use of silver as a restricted coinage to be determined by demand,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though if no bond-notes were issued in denominations under five dollars, the demand for its use as change would be greatly enhanced.

It should not be forgotten, either, that this plan is in harmony with the trend of thought among the American people. The grant of privilege to issue currency for profit is of itself obnoxious. It savors too much of favoritism and monopoly, which are the insidious but mortal enemies of equal right and just opportunity. Any system that should ignore this popular sentiment and in any manner farm out the power of the nation to regulate the currency to individuals or associations as a means of profit-making to such individuals or associations, would not only invite popular reprehension, but would make itself liable to exactly the same aspersions as have been so freely showered upon the advocates of the unrestricted coinage of silver, to wit: a design to control and use the powers of government to promote the interests of a class. Instead of giving the profits resulting from the grant of privilege to supply a circulating medium to individuals or corporations, this plan distributes the same equally between all users of currency. It does away, too, with the obnoxious principle of immunity from state and municipal taxation, which must always constitute an essential element of any banking system under federal control.

To recapitulate, then, we have shown that the proposed system of bond-notes will effect the following results, which are of prime importance to the success of the incoming administration:

It will eliminate the existing deficiency and furnish a sufficient surplus to meet expenses until the requisite tariff changes can provide a sufficient revenue.

It will smash the "endless chain" and permit the Secretary of the Treasury to regard with entire indifference the fluctuations of the money market.

It will immediately enhance the currency by releasing at least three-fourths of the gold reserve.

It will practically double the amount of legal-tender money and will free the whole currency from suspicion by making every part equal in value with every part.

By making a part of our paper currency all the time better than gold, it will be sought as reserves by institutions required by law to maintain reserves, and by persons holding money for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speculative opportunity or other purpose, and so put gold into circulation.

By avoiding the necessity for bank reserves it will leave gold free to perform the more important function of liquidating international balances.

Instead of granting favor to a class, it makes the whole people the nation's creditors and gives to all users of currency an equal opportunity to participate in the advantages resulting from its issue.

It will avoid all semblance of fiat money and all taint of a forced loan.

It will take the government wholly out of the brokerage business and remit the banks to their legitimate business of loans and discounts.

It will relieve the national banks of the burdens under which they groan and which they consent to bear only out of patriotic regard for the public welfare.

It will avoid even the appearance of putting the control of the currency in the hands of a class.

It will obviate the difficulty that is apt to be experienced with bank-currency, which is withdrawn from circulation when most needed, and is most abundant when least required.

It combines the advantages of a better currency with a more manageable indebtedness.

It offers an opportunity to refund our bonded debt at one-third its present rate.

It applies to the national debt the universal principle that a terminal obligation is more easily met than a demand obligation; and to our currency another universal principle, that interest and certainty of payment enhance the value and ensure the stability of all promises to pay.

It may not be an absolute panacea for monetary stringency, but it will never lend itself to increase financial panic.

It is new only in the sense that it applies our financial experience in the past to our existing financial conditions, and instead of retiring the legal-tenders immediately at a cost of four per cent. a year, provides for their amendment and gradual payment at one per cent.

ALBION W. TOURGÉE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROOT DIFFICULTIES OF IRISH GOVERNMENT.

BY T. W. RUSSELL, M. P., SECRETARY OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

THE subject which I propose to treat is one of admitted difficulty, and one upon which differing, and even divergent, views may legitimately be held by political students. But I have chosen it with some deliberation. And for this reason. After long years of political excitement, tumult, and disorder, a period which has unsettled much, and settled very little, the people of Ireland have reached a point where further heroics are, for the time being, impossible—when the exercise of what Tennyson calls "saving common sense" in political affairs is absolutely necessary. As George Macdonald has finely said: "Birds cannot always sing," and even the most fiery of politicians cannot always be on the war path. No matter how superhuman the ardor, the powder of agitation is apt to become damp. The rockets will not go off. Men are forced simply to sit still. The newspapers, of course, write away. That is their business. But at such times wise men possess their souls in patience, and give the precious fallow time to thought. Now—the country having reached such a period—I am going to try and reveal the inside of a man's mind, who has for many years taken some small part in the fierce strife of Irish parties; who has been proud to belong to that "thin red line" upon which the brunt of the ten years' conflict, produced by Mr. Gladstone's great surrender, fell. I shall say much probably with which party men will disagree and that will not be palatable. But one cannot get to the root of anything without giving and taking trouble—and I must trust to the indulgence of my readers for a patient hearing and a sane judgment.

Let us, first of all, then, get the bare facts down on the record and see where we are. For well nigh 800 years England has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been endeavoring to govern Ireland. In this work she has employed Governors of every kind and degree. She has summoned Parliaments of more or less authority. Content at one time to allow the ascendancy of a class to have its own way, she has at long last fallen back upon household suffrage. And the result, we are told, is dissatisfaction more or less widespread, discontent and disloyalty prevalent over great areas of the country, hostile representatives in Parliament, and grinding poverty, squalor, and destitution afflicting large masses of the people. Once this fact—and, to a considerable extent, it is a fact—gets solid lodgement one must perforce ask what it all means; one must press for the why and the wherefore of such a condition of affairs. Is the fault with the governors or does it lie at the doors of the governed? We cannot help asking why it is that England, the great colonizing power of the world, has after so long a trial achieved so little in Ireland; why a people who, in India, in Egypt, and all throughout Africa, has shown what can be done with, and for, mere "niggers," has been so unsuccessful in Ireland with Celts. It was exactly at this point, and on a survey of these facts, that Mr. Gladstone blundered into Home Rule. But nothing could have been worse than the *tactics* of the step then taken. In the first place, and, apart altogether from the wisdom of the proposals, Mr. Gladstone laid himself open to all sorts of misrepresentation. The General Election of 1885 resulted in placing Mr. Parnell in a commanding position. If the Liberal party was to come back to power the votes of the Irish Nationalist party had to be secured. They could only be secured at a certain price. Mr. Gladstone paid the price, became Prime Minister, formulated a scheme of Home Rule, disrupted the Liberal party, and went out of office in six months. Was this a case of genuine conviction and of conversion to Home Rule? Or rather was it what Lord Randolph Churchill described as the action of "an old man in a hurry"? I do not undertake to say. But, unquestionably, Mr. Gladstone fairly laid himself open to the charge of selling the convictions of a lifetime for eighty-six Irish votes. Then, again, as to *procedure*, what could have been worse? Just imagine a general election fought clearly and without doubt against the Irish demands. This was in November, 1885. Then in the spring of the following year, and without any consultation with the people—a complete somersault and a Home

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rule Bill! Even as a matter of procedure the method adopted was fatal. Had Mr. Gladstone followed the course he adopted on the Irish Church question—had he come forward at the opening of the Session of 1886, announced the change in his views, submitted resolutions in favor of the establishment of an Irish Parliament, and declared his intention of appealing to the country in the event of their rejection, the result might have been altogether different. The veteran Liberal leader took, as I conceive, the worst possible course. But, when all this is said, the solid fact remains that Mr. Gladstone became an enthusiastic Home Ruler—that he carried with him the great bulk of the old Liberal party, that a House of Commons, sitting at Westminster, passed a Home Rule bill through all its stages, and that things in Ireland can never quite be what they were before all this happened.

Now whatever Mr. Gladstone's position in 1885-86 may have been—whether he lusted for power, or was passionately convinced that the Act of Union was a mistake—no one can doubt that he and the bulk of the party he led are to-day firmly convinced about what they call the misgovernment of Ireland. And those of us who, with many doubts and difficulties, took another view of the situation—so far, at least, as the remedy is concerned—are bound, under the circumstances, to show cause for the attitude we have taken up. I am one of those people. I was a follower of Mr. Gladstone, and have never been able to deny the past misgovernment of Ireland. And as I do not believe that the true remedy for misgovernment of any kind can be found without a thorough and painstaking diagnosis of the evil, I should like to get, if possible, to the root of the matter. Let us then see what is at the bottom of the business. There are many root difficulties in the way of Irish government. But in the front rank I place

THE POVERTY OF IRELAND.

Now I am not going to spend time and labor in proving the poverty of the country in which I live. With the exception of a corner in the Northeast, Ireland has no manufacturing industry. Her old gentry have either disappeared, or are rapidly disappearing. I hear of coal and copper mines, but I never hear of anybody with capital who cares to invest a sovereign in any such ventures. There are fish on the seaboard, but few fishing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

boats and fewer real fishermen. We have, no doubt, a few rich brewers, distillers, and drink sellers. The professional classes also flourish and abound. But Ireland is, for all practical purposes, an agricultural country. And we all know what agriculture means to-day. There are whole counties and large areas of which, however, even this much cannot be said. Who will venture to call the peasantry of the greater part of the West agriculturalists? There are probably a quarter of a million of people in this country to whom the failure of a single year's potato crop means hardship, if not actual starvation. The small farmers in other parts of the country are oftentimes hard pressed, and with many of these a bad year makes rent paying difficult, whilst the tens of thousands of poor people who live in small towns and smaller villages, one hardly knows how, rarely know what the comforts and oftentime the decencies of life are. I will make any allowances that are desired. I will admit that the deposits in the Post Office Savings Banks have gone up by leaps and bounds; that the Joint Stock Savings Banks have the same pleasant story to tell; that the balances at the ordinary banks are large; that the main lines of railway are prospering; and that the Registrar-General's report as to the increase in cattle and the decrease in tillage is every year entirely satisfactory to the statistician. But when all this is said and admitted Ireland is still poor—poor actually, and in fact, and still poorer relatively when compared with Great Britain. Now, the common idea is that Ireland, being poor, must necessarily derive an immense advantage from her close connection with a rich country like Great Britain. And the common idea is, so far, quite correct. In the olden time—viz., before and towards the end of the last century, and, therefore, before the Act of Union was passed, England deliberately crippled Irish trade for the benefit of English traders. The merchants of Bristol had but to say the word and the thing was done. And sad havoc was undoubtedly wrought by such means. But whatever may be said for or against the Act of Union it undoubtedly made this course of conduct impossible. All trade within the United Kingdom is free and unfettered, and traders of every kind and degree are now on the same footing. This is a very great matter for the poorer country; and I do not know that anyone would care to deny it. And what I venture to call the advantages of Empire

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are not to be set aside lightly. There is an Ireland living, working, and earning good wages in Great Britain, which would starve at home. There is an Ireland in the Imperial Civil Service. In the army and navy Irishmen abound. In the Colonies they are everywhere to the front. All this is an enormous gain to the poorer country. There are, indeed, Irishmen who profess to believe that Ireland would be better off were she shut in within her own four seas, eating and living upon the produce of her own soil. I do not believe anything of the kind. The advantages of the world-wide Empire of which Ireland forms a part are enormous, and it is as fortunate as it is true that these advantages are confined neither to creed nor class. But this being so I feel bound to state that there is something to be said on the other side, and something, too, which merits very close attention. We all know what happens when poor people give themselves airs and begin to ape those whose means are greater. The result is oftentimes ruinous—it is always very absurd and ridiculous. Well, now, something like this has been going on for a very long time in Ireland.

The theory of taxation which obtains in this country is in principle this: Ireland and Scotland are dealt with just as if they were Yorkshire and Lancashire. There are, indeed, a few trifling taxes imposed in England which are not imposed in Ireland. But, for all practical purposes, Ireland pays into the Imperial exchequer just as Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Lincolnshire pay. Now, if we take the finding of the Royal Commission on the Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland—and on this point Englishmen and Irishmen agree—the proper or fair basis for Ireland to pay upon would be one-twentieth of the Imperial revenue. This is not the finding of Mr. Sexton and Mr. Redmond alone. It is the finding of men like the late Mr. Childers, of Lord Welby, an old Treasury official; of Lord Farrer, another ex-official, and of Sir David Barbour. This would mean that Ireland should have paid into the Imperial Treasury the sum of £4,842,781 in the year 1893-94, whereas she actually paid a sum amounting to £7,568,649. Now, it will at once be seen that, for a poor country, this raises a very serious question, and one about which much will be said in the immediate future. We hear already, indeed, of an Irish claim for arrears of overcharge amounting to over £100,000,000 sterling, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a demand for what is called a thorough and honest re-arrangement of taxation. But we may depend upon it that, whatever happens, judgment will not be allowed to go by default. And in the exceedingly luminous and able report of Sir David Barbour, the lines of the answer to what may turn out to be a somewhat premature charge, are calmly laid down. Sir David Barbour says, in effect, as I understand him, that it is true that one-twentieth of the whole revenue would be Ireland's fair basis of contribution, that she has (mainly and chiefly by her extravagant consumption of whiskey) been paying much more than this, but that if her contribution is to be calculated on the basis of "taxable capacity," the Imperial expenditure in Ireland must also be taken into account. And if this expenditure were to be calculated on the same basis, it was £3,791,498 in excess of what it ought to have been in 1893-94. Therefore, says the *Times:* "We are quits. Ireland pays too much into the Treasury. The Treasury pays out too much to Ireland, and the one balances the other."

I am not going to enter into this argument at all. This is not the object I have in view in referring to the financial relations between the two countries. Before I express any opinion upon such a thorny question I prefer to wait and hear the argument on both sides. But what I do wish to point out is this, and it is a thing the Commissioners felt themselves precluded from touching, viz., the extravagant expenditure on the government of Ireland. As things stand, nobody in this poor country has any interest in economy of government. We are virtually charged with our share of the expense of 20,000 soldiers—and to remove a single man from a garrison town is to inflame the whole population; we have a police force which partakes of a semi-military character, and which costs something like one and a half millions per annum. We have a vice-regal court, a judiciary—Superior and County—which in quality cannot be surpassed, but which in quantity is admittedly excessive. We have boards for everything—boards to educate our children, boards to fix rents, boards to dispense our charities, boards to lend money, boards to build bridges, boards to instruct people who are counted able to govern themselves, and other people as well, in the elementary principles of that science which teaches them how to earn their daily bread. But all this costs money, and a great deal of it. The taxation of this country is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mainly paid by the people who drink whiskey and tea, and who smoke tobacco. Here are the figures for the year 1893–94:

Total tax revenue of Ireland	£6,392,943
Proceeds from spirits, wine, beer, tea, and tobacco	4,848,489

And what I desire to emphasize is that the people at large pay; but that with the exception of the sums voted for education, the police and the army, the expenditure goes largely amongst a narrow class. So far as I can see, we are bound to accept the argument that Imperial expenditure in Ireland is local expenditure. I know this is not the view of the Irish Nationalist. I know it will be fiercely resented. We shall be told to remove our soldiers, to disband our police, to pension our judges—*that they are mainly kept going for Imperial and not for Irish* purposes. But all the same the charge for these services is paid out of the common purse. It is spent in Ireland, and is, therefore in my opinion, local expenditure, or money expended in this country in connection with the government of the country. But, as I have said, it is not the argument *pro* or *con* that I care about at present. What I desire to draw attention to is the fact that a country, admittedly poor and backward, has to keep up an expenditure practically on the basis of the expenditure of a rich and prosperous country and the still more ominous fact that nobody on this side of St. George's Channel cares one straw, or has any inducement to care, about any plans of economy. If, for example, an English Minister is strong enough and wise enough to say, when there is a vacancy on the Irish Bench: "I shall not fill it up. The Irish Judges are many in number and they have comparatively little to do"—at once the wigs are on the green. The bar is in revolt. Political animosities are promptly buried. Mr. Healy joins hands with Mr. Samuels. And why not? Up till now the imaginative Englishman has been under the impression that, inasmuch as the salaries of the judges are paid out of the Consolidated Fund, they are paid by England. We now know, however, that this is pure imagination; that every penny expended in Ireland from Imperial resources, no matter what it is, has been paid for by our noble army of native whiskey-drinkers, and, seeing that the Judge's salary will remain in England if he is not appointed, I confess that I can understand, if I do not appreciate, the argument which says: "Hang the judge, but let the country have the benefit of his salary!" This is all as pernicious as it well can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be. Ireland ought to pay a reasonable share of taxation. She ought to have an executive and a judiciary commensurate with her needs. And every man ought to have an interest in keeping the public expenditure within reasonable limits, which is the very opposite of what the present system encourages.

Again, let us take another example. Free Trade is one of those things about which all Englishmen are, or rather until lately were, inclined to boast. The bottom principle of free trade is unquestionably sound. The bottom principle I take to be this—that the exports from any country are paid for, not in money, but by imports, and so long as the imports into a country are in excess of the exports from it, always assuming, of course, that the latter represent a great volume of trade, the country must be prosperous and trade must be profitable. I agree that this is a sound principle, when applied to the whole country. But, when you tell an artisan, whose special trade has been ruined by some foreign product admitted free of duty to compete with his handiwork, that this is a sound axiom, he does not readily see it. The truth is that a principle may be sound as a whole, while capable of doing a great deal of mischief in detail. Now the imports into England greatly exceed the exports from that country. The figures for a given year were :

Imports	£408,000,000
Exports	287,000,000
Balance in favor of imports	£121,000,000

And so the Cobden Club rejoices. The English farmer may be in a bad way, special industries may suffer, but the country as a whole is all right. If people do not succeed in one thing they can and do try another. And this is true of England. But when we come to Ireland, that which I call the root principle of free trade will not work out. Our imports do not exceed our exports. It is the other way round. Here are the figures for a given year, as estimated by Sir R. Giffen :

Exports	£25,574,000
Imports	20,054,000

And the people cannot turn to anything else, for there is nothing else to turn to. Now, we may glorify the general principle of free trade as much as we like ; we may maintain that it has made England, but cannot we see that what may be a great success in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a mixed agricultural and industrial community may not work out the same result in a purely agricultural country? And so it has come about in Ireland. Ireland once produced wheat in large quantities. She produces next to none now. And why? Because, with the ports of the United Kingdom open to all the world, she cannot compete with California, Manitoba, India, and the Argentine. The industry is dead—has been clean killed off. So with other crops. The foreigner, with his superior climate, with his boundless tracts of practically free land, with freights that bring corn and cattle almost as cheap from the ends of the earth as our railways will take the same commodities from Galway to Liverpool—a thing that Cobden never dreamt of—has it all his own way. And so it comes about that the Irish figures will not work out on free trade principles in favor of free trade. But, of course, we cannot have two fiscal policies in the two countries. I agree it is quite impossible. And what is called "Home Rule" would not cure this evil. But it does not follow that England ought to calmly conclude that because a thing is good for her it must, therefore, be good for a people wholly and entirely different in conditions and in circumstances.

To sum up, then, on this head, we have here an undoubtedly backward and poor country in close union with a rich and prosperous country. The poor country pays in taxation just what the rich pays—not, of course, in amount, but on the same principle. There is no compulsion. Let this be clearly understood. We do it out of our poverty and in the exercise of our blessed free will. But it is done. In addition to this we have an extravagant expenditure on the government of the country. And, finally, we have a fiscal policy which, benefiting the rich country, has grievously handicapped the main industry of Ireland. It has no doubt given the people cheap food—a priceless boon. It has enabled people to get luxuries who but for the change would have had to be content with bare necessaries. But free trade, as the figures show, has not worked out in Ireland as it has done in the industrial and richer sister country. This poverty, accentuated by the means I have described, is at the very root of the Irish difficulty. A people living as thousands of Irishmen live can never, and never ought to be, content. There must be a way out, and it ought to be the business of statesmen to find that way.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The second root difficulty in the government of Ireland is

THE IRISH AGRARIAN SYSTEM.

I had almost placed this difficulty in the front, and if I had been writing fifteen or sixteen years ago I should have placed it there. But, for sufficient reasons, I place it second. The story of agrarian Ireland is nothing less than a tragedy. Space will not permit the story to be unfolded from the beginning. But, for practical purposes, I start from the establishment of the English law of tenure in this country. And I only refer to this in order to make clear the fact that it supplanted the old Irish custom by which the peasant had certain rights in the soil. It is important to note this, for down through the centuries, and in spite of repeated confiscations, this old idea of peasant ownership lingers, preserved, apparently, by some curious antiseptic power in the Celtic nature. But with this important fact admitted, let us look at the agrarian difficulty. What are the facts? Go—read the report of the Devon Commission if information is wanted. Lord Devon was a great Irish landowner. But his report is a perfect mine for the student. Up to the year 1870 the Irish tenant possessed no legal property in the soil. He had, in the great majority of cases, built his own house, reclaimed, drained, and fenced the land. By law, the house which he had built, and every atom of improvement he had made, belonged to the landlord. Under the Encumbered Estates Court Act, for example, the whole of the tenant's property was expressly conveyed with the freehold to the new purchasers. The second fact is that, without cause, and with the rent fully paid, he could be evicted and his whole property confiscated. This is no fancy picture. When I first entered Irish politics this was English law in Ireland, and every day in Irish counties this law was wont to be enforced by policemen paid for out of Irish taxes. By a long, laborious, and arduous fight—by the constitutional labors of men like Sharman Crawford, Dr. McKnight, Richard Smyth, Hugh Law, and Isaac Butt, aye, and shame be it said that it should have required it, by the unconstitutional work of the Land League, this horrid system has been all but brought to the ground. I have a friend whose history is a complete epitome of the Irish land question. The son of an evicted tenant, he is now a prosperous well-to-do man. Evicted in the pre-1870 days, when an Irish tenant had no legal property in the soil, and when "the agent" could do pretty well

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what he liked, this friend of mine realized to the full what all this meant. With what result? He is one of the most intelligent and reasonable of men. But he hates England. He hates landlordism. He would do me or mine any service in this world —but *vote* for me. This he could not be prevailed upon to do.

This feeling, indefinitely multiplied all over the world and transmitted from father to son, is what the Irish land laws have done for England. Yes, we have righted many of the wrongs. No one knows it better than I do. I know that eviction is not so easy as it was, and that at the best it is now a costly enterprise. I know that the expenditure of a tenant on house and land cannot be confiscated, as in olden days. I know that we are rooting the peasant in the soil once again either as occupier or owner—that he has emerged from his long night of serfdom and is at last a freeman. But at what cost has all this been done? I remember at the close of the Session of 1878—just after the Irish Sunday Closing Bill had been passed—I stood in the lobby of the House of Commons conversing with the late Mr. Parnell. He had voted all through in favor of that bill, and I thanked him. "Now," he said, "we are done with liquor for some time; we must see about land." "Ah!" I replied, "that will be even a tougher job. It will require an earthquake to upset the Irish land system." "Then," replied Mr. Parnell, "earthquake be it." And the earthquake came. But who can estimate the ruin and suffering and demoralization that ensued? And where are we now? We have reached daylight, so far as the Statute Book is concerned, only to be faced with two fresh and very serious difficulties. Agriculture, as a paying industry, appears in danger of disappearing. Even with the highest farming, the farmers of Great Britain are hardly able to hold their own. In the last session of Parliament government had to come to their relief. And if this be the case what is to become of the small farmers of Ireland, many of whom do not even know the rudiments of the business they are supposed to follow?

I say nothing of the seasons—they come and go. With low prices for agricultural produce we may get cheap food—we shall not secure agricultural content, and in a country like Ireland the absence of this is fatal. And the landlord also finds himself face to face with a new difficulty; for, with fifteen per cent. struck off the rents in 1881, and a second reduction of a serious char-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acter impending in 1897—for very many, I fear, this means a clean sweep of the margin which sufficed for existence. In the days when the landlords made the land laws for themselves all went well. These were indeed halcyon times for them. And in what seems to have been sheer recklessness, the landed property of Ireland was mortgaged and charged to the very throat. Nobody appeared to think of the future, but now the storm has burst. The present race of landlords are, most of them, perfectly innocent, but they must know that Parliament can neither raise nor lower prices. They must be aware that a Parliament, responsible to the people, and not to a class, could not, and ought not, to maintain the injustices of the old land system. I read a speech delivered the other day by an Ulster member, a great friend of mine, in which he was reported to have gaily referred to the land question as being "settled." Settled forsooth! The lines of settlement have, indeed, I am thankful to think, been successfully laid. But the actual settlement is yet far off. The one thing certain is that before five years have passed the margin upon which many, very many landlords have lived, will have disappeared, not by the operations of any Land Act, old or new, but by the working of economic causes.

From this sketch it will be seen how great are the difficulties of the Irish Agrarian system. We have first the whole area of the congested districts where a single bad season throws everything out of gear and produces discontent and sometimes disorder. Next we have the memories of harsh and unjust laws—under which the mind of a whole people has been poisoned and embittered. Added to this we have the serious trouble caused by the very effort to remedy these wrongs, and, finally, just as daylight appears, the whole industry of agriculture is upset, if not paralyzed. The situation is one of extraordinary difficulty, and will tax the energies and statesmanship of the strongest minds that can be brought to bear upon it.

The third difficulty which presents itself is one even harder to deal with, viz.:

THE DIFFERENCE IN RACE AND RELIGION

of the people living in Ireland. I am, of course, aware that in the minds of many people this is the root difficulty in the government of the country. The mere fact that the great mass of the Irish people are Celts and Roman Catholics accounts for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

everything that is wrong. I cannot admit this; but, on the other hand, it is impossible for any one studying the facts of Irish life to ignore it. Nothing is more common than the statement—I have heard it many hundreds of times—that if Ireland were all like Ulster the whole problem of government would be solved. And it is often put in another way, which indicates that Roman Catholicism is the real tap-root of the ever-present mischief. I am not going to say that there is nothing to be said for these twin contentions. It is possible that if we could apply the business energy of Belfast and of parts of Ulster to the south of Ireland marvellous results might ensue. We might also lose a little—for your Belfast man is not an entirely lovely character. It is quite possible also that the free breath of Protestantism might work wonders if allowed to operate all over the land. I am not in the least concerned to deny this, for, in truth, I believe it. But the statesman is not at liberty to contemplate these things. He cannot look for a new heaven and a new earth on such lines. He cannot contemplate the disappearance from the face of the earth of the Irish Celt, rather the reverse; much less can he calculate upon the extinction of that wonderful ecclesiastical organization which, as Macaulay finely says, was "great before the Frank had passed the Rhine and before the Saxon had set foot in Britain." But the difficulty caused by these two factors is seen at every step. The Ulsterman very frequently knows infinitely more of Scotland than he does of the South or West of Ireland, and would often be a greater stranger in Dublin and Cork than he would be in Glasgow. Between North and South there is little or no community of feeling. And even in the Northern province itself the two peoples, almost equal in numbers, are kept separate and apart as if by a wall of fire, owing to the force of old feuds and bitter memories. The effect of this is to destroy all real national life. The "old race," as it is called, conquered and overborne, subject in the past to confiscation and persecution, long denied education and civil rights, but rapidly emerging in the sunshine of saner times to better things, stands for Ireland and all they understand by it. The descendants of the Settlers, and those who, in the Providence of God, have found their home here, stand for England and the Empire. Their lives are to a great extent lived wholly apart. At certain seasons of the year

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they even frown upon and fight with each other. The glorious memories of the one are memories of sorrow and defeat to the other. Derry thrills the heart of the Protestant. To the Roman Catholic the crimson banner is the symbol of a lost cause. The Roman Catholic glories in Patrick Sarsfield and Owen Roe; delights in Limerick, Benburb, and the Yellow Ford. But these waken no enthusiasm in the breast of what I may call for convenience the English in Ireland. The fact really is that there are two Irelands; that genuine national feeling does not exist; that the parties live often simply to thwart each other. They have few aims or aspirations in common. Now, the real difficulty arising out of all this to-day lies in the fact that the government of the past was for the few and not for the many; that avowedly, and it may be necessarily, government existed for the benefit of the English garrison and, not for the Irish people. Possible in days that are happily gone, when men's minds moved in a narrower circle, such a system of government is absolutely impossible now. We have got to a higher altitude. But the operation of changing the old order is not a pleasant one. It is everywhere painful. There is a wrench at every step. The American poet Whittier, writing of the overthrow of American slavery, once finely said: "Fierce burns the fire where wrongs expire." And when privilege gives place to equality the process is by no means pleasant. The truth is that we have reached a point when every act of justice is described as a concession; when to enfranchise one class is held as being tantamount to despoiling another. We are in the transition state; hence the difficulty.

The fourth and last root difficulty to which I propose to refer is the all but complete

ABSENCE OF INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE.

I have already referred to the fact that, apart from a corner in the northeast, Ireland is a purely agricultural country. And the absence of manufactures, accounting for much in the condition of the country, opens up one of the most contentious of questions. If I ask how it comes that manufactures flourish in some parts of Ulster, and that they are generally absent in Munster, I am at once referred to the legislation of the last century. I am told to look at the Coombe, and to think of the time before its glory had departed. I have already said what I think about the

Univ. of Tulsa Library
Tulsa, Oklahoma

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislation of the English Parliament in those days. It was mean and selfish to a degree. But it is all nonsense to say that the position of Ireland to-day is practically affected by legislation which has had no operative effect for a hundred years. If factories can be started and successfully worked in Caledon, and Castlecaulfield, two villages in South Tyrone, there is no reason that I know of, so far as government and legislation are concerned, why similar factories should not spring up in the counties of Cork or Kerry. There is no reason why Blarney should not be indefinitely multiplied. There is very little coal in Tyrone, and for purposes of freight Cork is as near the south of England as Tyrone is to Glasgow. The difference is not great. Girl labor ought to be more plentiful in the South than it is in the North. And the expert knowledge can be had in the one place as cheaply as in the other. Why, then, do factories spring up in the one place and not in the other? Why is the factory line practically drawn at Drogheda? Why is it that the drink industry alone flourishes in the South and West? The true answer to this question would take us far in argument, further than I care to go. But, unquestionably, the absence of manufactures, causing, as it does, an abnormal drain on the land, is one of the chief difficulties in the government of Ireland.

Now, it may be said, "You have told us what is wrong. Will you be good enough to go a little further and tell us how things are to be set right." I admit that the question is fair. But I have no patent specific for the disease. There are those who say, and who believe, that the disease is incurable, that the Celt is irreclaimable, and that things must just flounder on, every man doing the best he can for himself. There are others who maintain that the mischief is all due to what they call the domination and injustice of an alien government, and what is practically a foreign power. They tell us that the union of the two countries was a blunder as well as a crime, that Ireland was as wealthy in 1850 as she is now, the wealth now, of course, being spread over a smaller population, and that nothing can be done so long as self-government is denied to the people. I am not convinced of either of these contentions. I do not believe in the depravity of the Celt. I admit that wherever you find him he is troublesome. Lighthearted and gay, clever and somewhat unscrupulous, he *is* apt to worry and even drive to despair his slow and oftentimes stupid govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ors. But he has great and brilliant qualities and cannot be surrendered to despair. Nor can I accept the other proposition—that the union was a mistake. I, however, can and do understand the contention. And I admit that there is much in the past history of Ireland to enforce the claim. I prefer what I consider a nobler policy. I am for union, not disintegration. But, for this policy to be successful, the two parties in Ireland must loyally co-operate. What I venture to call, for convenience, the English in Ireland must recognize that the country is not entirely theirs, that they are a minority, an important minority, no doubt, but still a minority, possessing rights—but rights to be shared by all. Every vestige of privilege or inequality ought to go. If I had the power I should leave the Home Ruler with absolutely nothing to rely upon in argument save the claim advanced on National grounds.

I would destroy every vestige of grievance. And in addition to this I would have England recognize that she also has present day duties to the country she so long neglected. During the last twenty-five years very much has been done in this way. Religious equality has been secured. Agrarian reform has been accomplished. But no one conversant with the mind of the English people can fail to realize that, at present, they are a little wearied of Ireland. Having put their hand to the plough they are inclined to look back. They imagine that twenty-five years of well doing can obliterate centuries of neglect. My own view is that England owes much to Ireland, and that the account between the two countries is far from being squared. In my opinion England has never fully realized the financial aspects of the union, and how these have told against the poorer country. That was enough. But with a rigid policy of undoing the wrongs of the past, a generous recognition of the needs of the present day, and the exercise of a kindly patience on both sides, there is hope for even a closer union than that which an Act of Parliament has been able to cement. This is not a change to be brought about in a day. But it is in times of calm, and not when the storm winds blow, that healing work of this kind should be done. We are in the doldrums now. We may be in the rapids to-morrow.

T. W. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME ASPECTS OF THE DRAMA OF TO-DAY.

BY HERBERT BEERBOHM TREE.

WHETHER it be in society, on the platform, or in the newspaper press, we see evidences of the all-pervading interest which is taken in the drama nowadays. Indeed, the attention given to matters theatrical is not less absorbing than that which is devoted to football news, or the latest utterances of a retired statesman. Nowadays, every second man is a would-be dramatist, every other woman a potential actress. The interest in the stage is not confined to that enthusiastic person, the constant playgoer—it extends to those platonic patrons of the drama who never enter the portals of a theatre; it embraces that sympathetic individual, the *laudator temporis acti*, who is ever prepared to bewail the death of the drama, and to weep the ready tear over its untenanted grave. It is not my intention to assist the readers of this magazine in holding a kind of literary autopsy on the body dramatic. We have heard something too much of late of such functions, whose melancholy enquiries have generally resulted in a verdict of manslaughter against that arch-enemy of progress, the actor-manager. Whatever may be its ailments, the drama is not suffering from want of medical attendance, for disagreeing doctors are constantly warring over its prostrate but pulsating body. If one may dissent from the maxim, "whatever is, is right," one may surely be excused from joining in the chorus of "whatever is, is wrong," as sung by the sentimental re-actionaries who worship the past at the expense of the present, who disparage their ancestors when living, and write pæans to them when dead. If results (as Nature tells us) are obtained by striving, this should be a prolific period for our drama; for never, assuredly, was there a time when among authors and managers a more honorable rivalry obtained to produce distinguished work.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The dramatic output of each generation is the direct result of that generation's thought and tendency, although a demand for work of the highest kind usually receives its impetus from some exceptional creative or executive genius who is the highest product of his age. And, too, geniuses grow in clusters, whether they be great poets, great painters, great statesmen, great generals, great gentlemen, or great dramatists. Witness the Elizabethan era.

We have all been crying in the wilderness for the manna of dramatic literature, and it would be strange indeed if, in defiance of all the laws of supply and demand, that manna did not descend from the dramatic firmament. It is impossible that the same sort of romance or the same sort of realism in art should emanate from, say, the Georgian period and the Victorian era. Each age has its offspring after its kind, and according to the social conditions which govern it. The more strenuous habits of the people of to-day, the greater brevity in the expression of thought, the increased dramatic precision, the decay of eloquence, and the development of force, make for a different sort of literature and a different sort of drama. The best plays of to-day are keener, less mannered, less heroic, less epic, but probably more direct and swifter in effect, if not deeper, than those of the early part of the century. If there is to-day a widespread taste for the lighter forms of entertainment, yet there is at the other extreme of the dramatic scale a great and vital demand for serious work. We have passed through a period of undue pessimism, and now the ultra-realistic or morbid drama has in its turn given place to romanticism. Each school has its ardent champions who, from the formidable bulwarks of their respective newspapers, shoot peas at each other with pleasing regularity. For me, I love them both. I confess I do not share this leaning towards a morbid monogamy in matters of art; the Muses must not be regarded as purely domestic creatures. People talk as though romance and the problem play were two things of some sudden birth, as though we had either lately discovered problems, or had been lately born anew in romance. One day we are told that this is the age of the problem play. We are fascinated by Ibsen, by "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray," and are under the sway of the new woman in literature, as it might appear, when lo! the voice goes up in the wilderness, "How long, how long will this problem business last?" And with a gayety and a sud-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

denness which come of the gods and not of men, down swoops romance, and again a new world has been discovered.

But what are the facts of the case? Romance and Realism have always been perennially interchangeable. They never interfere with each other. They are the most polite rivals in existence. They are like those Swiss clocks with a little wooden man and a little wooden woman in a little wooden sentinel box. When it is going to rain and wet the dainty robes of Romance (Romance always has robes), back steps Miss Romance into her little wooden box, and out pops the little wooden man called Realism (and you know Realism always has draggled skirts!). These little gentry—in the clock of the stage—they love each other, but they can never be out together. There is no keeping company for them! Like rival stars, they never appear together—when the one is out the other is in, out of the wet, or out of the sun, as the case may be. They never embrace, but they never quarrel. Let us be patient with the great discoverers who are constantly making comparisons and prophecies and proclamations to thrill that great public who care little whether they are given Romance, or the Problem Play, or the Comedy of Manners, so long as the fare provided be interesting and amusing, amusing in the highest sense of the term; at the apex of its expression reaching beauty, at its base touching burlesque. For the time being, modern blank-verse dramas can scarcely hold us, or convince us. We are not in touch with them. We incline to the prose of the telegram, not to the chorus from Olympus. Our drama of to-day comes nearer the vernacular. We love wit more than poetry, and cleverness more than prosody. I confess myself to being somewhat alarmed when I find myself face to face with a play written in the medium employed by Sheridan Knowles. The blank verse is apt to be somewhat echoic, and it seems to me only suitable when the stately march of its eloquence is employed as Shakespeare employed it—and that employment we find but seldom in his followers. This medium of expression is apt to be unconvincing—to detract from, rather than add to, the illusion at which all drama must aim.

And here we come to the very Alpha and Omega of stage science—illusion. Everything that tends to aid illusion, to stimulate the imagination of an audience, is legitimate on the stage. Everything that detracts from illusion is illegitimate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We hear a great deal of cant talked by those who insist that the ideal stage setting should be a green baize, whose decoration should consist of placards inscribed, "This is a street," "This is a house," "This is heaven." In all this there seems to me something of affectation. If Shakespeare's poetry could be better or more reverently illustrated by such means, I would say: "Take away those baubles of scenery, of costume, and of archæological accessories!" It was all very well for David Garrick to appear in a powdered tie-wig, a Georgian coat, and silk stockings, when he was impersonating the *Thane of Cawdor;* but he created the effect (which undoubtedly he did create) not by virtue of the incorrectness of his costume, but in spite of it. The greater knowledge of historical periods possessed by our theatre-goers of to-day, the increased sense of humor, the demand for luxury, require general and detailed illusion in the appointments of the stage, and to deny it to theatre-goers is to be affectedly superior to one's age, and belated in the movements of the time. Every artist uses the material which his generation places at his disposal. If the painter lacked paint and canvas, he would content himself with the flag-stone and a piece of chalk, if the musician lacked a Stradivarius he would still be returning to the old tooth-comb; but why complain of the canvas and the paint and the Stradivarius! The increase of picturesqueness in all the arts, the complete revolution in taste as regards house decoration, the greater cultivation of the eye, all these have tended to what has been contemptuously called the "millinery" of the drama. I admit that there has been a tendency towards an over-elaborate decoration, which may have sometimes swamped the beauty of the poet—and here taste must always be the arbiter—but I cannot think that the public would nowadays be so readily inclined to listen to Shakespeare's noble dramas did they not receive that splendor of setting which modern ingenuity and modern resource have placed at the disposal of the stage manager of to-day.

Briefly, mechanical devices should be avoided, if illusion can be given without them; and it should be remembered that the real thing may, on the stage, be not so effective as the ingenious make-believe. Suggestion is often better than an undue insistence on detail. In the same way the art of the dramatist and of the actor is not to give us a mere photographic representation of life, or of its detached and perhaps commonplace incidents, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather to epitomize for us a whole career, to present the heart of an incident, to give in one crystal of a thousand facets the aspects, impressions, inflections, and modifications of a life, to suggest to the imagination of the audience by the illustration of dialogue, or by the presentation of character, the artistic embodiment of a man or a woman, rather than the photographic actuality. Were it otherwise, then the blacksmith should be taken from the blacksmith's shop, the costermonger from the barrow, to represent the passions through which the blacksmith and the costermonger may be supposed to pass. That would be photographic. And, as Mr. Whistler once remarked, there is something in art that even a photographer does not always achieve. But what is the actor? It is he who was never a blacksmith or a costermonger, yet who, by his power of observation and through the medium of his adaptive physical organism, can suggest those characters. It is the dramatist's art to outline the character, to seize upon its vital moments, to depict the situation, and it is the actor's art to make that man and that situation live. It seems to me there is only one way to act, that is by impersonation; but, for some occult reason, there are still those who regard the art of acting as if it were a co-operative store, which is subdivided into departments: the grocery department, the haberdashery department, the tailoring department, and so on. In the same way, there existed a tradition of the stage which prescribed certain "lines of business"—one of those traditions, which are, I think, made by fools for wise men to break.

Among these "lines of business" was the first old man, the leading man, the first low comedian, the walking gentleman, the second old man, the light comedian, the second low comedian, the heavy man, the utility man, the leading lady, the singing chambermaid, the heavy lady, and so on. The sanctity of the laws of the Medes and Persians was as nothing compared with the sanctity which governed the "lines of business" in the olden days. And I believe that for the singing chambermaid to have trenched by one hair's breadth on the domain of the walking lady would have been an offence to extenuate which the rack were too mild a form of torture. I am glad to think that this ancient prejudice is passing away, for though in its time the demarcation may have had its uses, I fancy it had still greater abuses; and an actor nowadays is no longer regarded as a heretic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if he substitutes for the "damnable iteration" of his own personality, in a fixed line of business, the artistic embodiment of various and opposite characters.

There is another cant expression, which I would be glad to see eliminated from the dictionary of acting; that is, the phrase "character acting." All acting should be character acting. What is *Shylock?* A character part. What are *Macbeth* and *Richard III.* but character parts? What are *Hamlet, Iago,* or *Othello* but character parts? What are *Brutus, Mark Antony* and *Cassius?* Such characters as *Romeo* of course require the appearance of youth and those graces of person which will alone commend the Mantuan lover to his *Juliet.* But even here, an audience will be more moved by the intellectual suggestion of a Jean de Reszké, than by the inadequate posturings of a youthful nincompoop. The meaning of "character acting" in the ordinary acceptance of the word, I take it, is the assumption of a character which is afflicted with either mental or physical eccentricity. Nowadays, as I have said, lines of business have become merged, and most managers will cast their plays according to the ability of the actor to embody his part; thus an actor will one day play an old man, another day a young man, and so on. I believe Mr. Frank Benson, who has done so much to uphold the banner of Shakespeare in the English provinces, recognizes no "lines of business," and his actors accordingly have the advantage of playing a round of parts, one differing from the other; and so they obtain greater freedom and have opportunities for the exercise of that versatility so necessary to the development of the actor's art.

If acting is an art, then it should be the highest endeavor of the actor to so cultivate his sensitive and imaginative being that he can at will become absorbed in whatever character he is portraying and give appropriate utterance to the feelings, the manners, and the passions of that individual. In this respect he is on a level with the literary artist. It would never be held that the author should be perpetually grinning through the horse collar of his characters; and if the imaginative faculty be developed in him, his characters, though foreign to his own nature, will yet act and speak in a fashion appropriate to them. This power of affecting the imagination is not merely a matter of externa

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disguise or make-up; it is something that comes from within; it is the assumption of a character—character-acting, if you will. It is happily no longer essential to popular success that an actor should cultivate peculiarities and tricks of speech, by which he should be recognized if possible before entering upon the stage. "This," as a brilliant critic once remarked of a performance of the present writer, "this is no way to behave." Of course, an actor, like an author, is known by his style, and a dominant individuality is of the greatest value to him as it is to the author; mere mimicry is not the be-all and end-all of acting. One may be an excellent imitator, and yet an indifferent actor. How often do we not see an artist who, instead of employing the vehicle of his own resources, will seek to make an effect by imitating the blemishes of an acknowledged master? Strange that when men seek to flatter their superiors they should do so by imitating their infirmities! Because the Venus of Milo has no arms, it does not follow that a perfect piece of sculpture needs necessarily be arrived at by omitting those members from the statue. It does not follow because Cromwell had a wart on his nose, that a man should become a statesman or a reformer because he happened to have a like nasal superfluity.

We have, as I have hinted earlier, heard much of late of the baneful influence of the actor-manager, to whom all the evils to which dramatic flesh is heir have been traced. A newspaper was recently put into my hands, containing an article signed by one who is supposed to be responsible in directing public opinion in matters theatrical. In the course of this article, statements were made which, however ridiculous to the initiated, are yet calculated to mislead the public—to detract from the dignity of the calling which is assailed, and to lessen the regard in which it is held. It was stated that the actors who preside over our principal London theatres are animated in the conduct of those theatres by unworthy motives; that they have no sincere regard for the art which they are supposed to represent; that their actions are informed only by vanity, by self-aggrandizement, and by a greed for gold. Now, I will admit that an actor is subject, as is every artist, as indeed is every man who leads a public life, to that self-contemplation which in the unsuccessful is called vanity and which in the successful is often called laudable ambition. Few among us will pretend to an indifference to that advancement in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the opinion of our fellow-men which is called popularity, nor is the substantial reward which it ensures to be held in contempt. But this much I will say, without fear of contradiction, that the bulk af artistic achievement given to the stage during our generation has been due to the actor-manager.

The lay-manager exploits a commercial enterprise ; the actor lives in his art as well as by it. "The reason why your drama in England is so vital," said an eminent French actor to me, "is that your theatres are governed by artists and not by tradesmen." The actor who makes sacrifices in struggling for the highest is not a martyr, he is a devotee, maybe an epicure ; his joy is more in his art than in his balance-sheet. But let us not be boastful of our ruling passions, or make a virtue of our pleasant inclinings.

To briefly review the history of the stage of the last fifty years, who have been the great managers ? I mean the managers whose labors have been directed towards the highest class of work. Their names jump to the mind of every playgoer. There are men still living to whom the name of Macready is something more than a memory. The next name on which the high light of theatrical history falls is that of Charles Kean, who devoted to the production of Shakespearian and modern plays all the sumptuous description and illustrative decoration which the ambitious actor-manager of to-day gives to his work. Then come such as Phelps and Charles Calvert, who worked steadily for their art. So in America did Edwin Booth, Forrest and Barrett. In our own time we have the history of the Bancroft management at the Prince of Wales' and Haymarket theatres—the Bancrofts who were, I think, the pioneers of our modern drama. We have the brilliant record of Henry Irving, whose untiring devotion to the highest interests of our art is the pride of us all. We have the Kendals and John Hare, whose efforts both as artists and managers are assuredly deserving of the gratitude of the public. We have to-day Richard Mansfield, Wilson Barrett, Charles Wyndham, and George Alexander. We have Edward Compton and Frank Benson, not to mention the younger generation which is knocking at our door. The late Augustus Harris will be remembered chiefly by his splendid efforts in the cause of opera ; but he too was at one time an actor, and, had he lived, would have devoted himself to the production of Shakespeare on a scale

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of worthy magnificence. I am far from saying that a lay-manager must of necessity be an undesirable director of a theatre. On the contrary, I will go so far as to admit that, given the sympathy and the capacity for his work, the lay-manager should be the ideal head of a theatre, for he is not oppressed with the double labor which acting entails. Yet in all time and in all arts, it is the artist himself, whose enthusiasm has given, and will preserve for his time, the masterpieces of the arts. It is the poet, not the publisher; the painter, not the picture-dealer.

If England or America cannot boast a national or state-subsidized theatre, we still may trust to that public spirit which finds expression in responsible and individual effort. And, if the pecuniary reward of such efforts is not always great, yet the worker leaves behind something whose value cannot be appraised by the standard of the death-duties.

H. Beerbohm Tree.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FOLLY OF DIFFERENTIAL DUTIES

BY CAPTAIN JOHN CODMAN.

In discussing the shipping question during the last quarter of a century, I have so often been obliged to combat proposed systems of bounties and subsidies, that it is a relief to find that they are now at last abandoned by their advocates, as ineffectual and impracticable.

From the time when the first of the many "investigating committees" was appointed by Congress in 1870, and the Hon. John Lynch, of Maine, its Chairman, seriously maintained that it should be our policy to encourage the wooden shipbuilding of his constituents by bounties, in order that their sailing vessels might drive the iron steamships of England from the seas, various attempts have been made in that direction coupled with more plausible movements in favor of subsidies, the argument being that England acquired her maritime supremacy by paying a few of her steamers for carrying the mails, although the number of vessels that received money for that purpose from the postal department did not amount to more than two per cent. of her merchant fleet. The bounty scheme was the first to be abandoned, but the proposition for a subsidy was urged with such persistency that it was at last adopted five years ago. It was enormous in some of its provisions, as, for instance, in that which offered to a swift class of steamships on the transatlantic route four dollars for every statute mile for the outward passage. And yet it remained in abeyance until by an act of special legislation two British steamships were transferred to our flag on condition that two similar ships should be built in American shipyards to complete the line. It was an expensive experiment for the government, inasmuch as the subsidy it pays to these four ships is over eight hundred thousand dollars per annum. Still,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it may be cheap in the end, for although the same terms of payment are open to all American built ships of a similar character, it has not been taken advantage of any further. The admission is at last forced upon Congress and the people that our once prosperous carrying trade is not to be restored either by bounties or subsidies. Thus a great point is gained.

Now comes another proposition that it will be more difficult to carry into successful effect than either of the others that have passed into oblivion. This is the proposal for the restoration of the early American policy of discriminating duties enunciated by the Republican party in its last national platform, and advocated by Mr. Alex. R. Smith, Secretary of the Merchant Marine Association, in the October number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. I do not propose to criticise Mr. Smith's article in detail, or to controvert the quotations he makes from the *Pennsylvania Packet* of 1790 and the *London Times* of 1827, which, with others of the same character that he cites, have no bearing on the subject. His main point is that, since the discriminating duties that existed previous to 1828 were abrogated, our merchant marine has steadily declined until "to-day a beggarly eleven per cent. is the sum total of American carriage."

Manifestly we should have everything back again as it was in 1828—discriminating duties, old wooden ships, and all—for he does not seem to take into account the changes in marine architecture, the necessities of the world at large with which we are connected, or the new methods of commerce which time has developed. He seems to think that if the world has moved at all, it has moved in the wrong direction, and, therefore, he wishes Congress to put a shoulder to it and pry it back to where it was sixty-eight years ago.

I commend to Mr. Smith's attention an extract from an article written by Dr. Channing in 1829, with which, however, he will not be likely to agree. That distinguished humanitarian had for a protective tariff an Eighth Commandment and a Gospel hatred. He desired to strangle the monster in its early youth.

"To this country, above all others, belongs, as its primary duty and interest, the support of liberal principles. It has nothing in its institutions congenial with the maxims of barbarous ages, with the narrow, monopolizing restricted legislation of antiquated despotism. Freedom, in all its forms, is our life, strength, prosperity, and every system at war with it, however speciously maintained, is a contradiction to our character—and, wanting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

harmony with our spirit, must take something, however silently, from the energy of the institutions which hold us together. As citizens of the world, we grieve that this country should help to prolong prejudices which even monarchy is outgrowing; should, in imitation of meddling despotisms, undertake to direct the industry and capital of the citizens, and especially should lose sight of that sublime object of philanthropy, the promotion of free, unrestricted commerce throughout the world. The interests of human nature require that every fetter should be broken from the intercourse of nations, that the most distant countries should exchange all their products, whether of manual or intellectual labor, as freely as the members of the same community."

When the discriminating duties were abolished in 1828 the act was mutual on our part and on that of other nations with whom we had commercial intercourse. It proved to be more for our advantage than for theirs. The only objection to it that we can now see is that it did not go far enough. As Mr. Smith admits, in the era of wooden shipbuilding our vessels were cheaper and better constructed than those of most other nations, all of which enforced the same restrictive navigation laws that we alone still retain. If a proposition for a general abandonment of these laws had been made by other nations in 1828, our government would at once have seen its advantage in acceding to it; and again in 1849, when England swept her restrictive laws from her statute books for the sake of allowing her subjects to buy our ships, this country would have reciprocated if it had been asked to do so. But England did not desire this then any more than she desires it now. It is not for her interest to sell us her ships, and the only mistake she has made has been in allowing her shipyards to turn out vessels for other nations who have thus become her competitors in ship owning at first, and, eventually, in shipbuilding.

Two years ago an eminent Scotch shipbuilder wrote:

"It is a matter of regret to us that there is likely to be a change in the American registry laws. For the last thirty years they have permitted us to build, and largely to own, nearly all the ships that the ocean-carrying trade requires; and they have caused a loss to their people of about £40,000,000 sterling annually of freight money that they might have appropriated to themselves. Their new policy of free ships, if adopted now, would unquestionably benefit our ship-yards for one or two years; but the competition to which American shipwrights would be forced would soon enable them to divide with us the ship-building, and their countrymen to divide with us the ship-owning of the world, in both of which industries they have heretofore so kindly given us the practical monopoly."

Fortunately for the Scotchmen, and unfortunately for us, an eminent American shipbuilder prevented the anticipated measure from becoming a law.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is quite natural that, as Mr. Smith asserts, there should have been a temporary falling off in our tonnage immediately after discriminating duties were abrogated. Cautious shipowners, instead of giving orders for new vessels, waited to see what would be the effect of the sudden change. When they found by experience that it inured greatly to their benefit, when they saw that there was a demand for American ships in all the ports of the world, and that our vessels commanded higher freights than English ships even in the carrying trade between Great Britain and her colonies, they entered with renewed zeal and activity into the business, and the result was that our ocean tonnage steadily increased until it reached its culminating point in 1855, at which period it stood at 2,535,136 tons, as against 812,619 in 1828. It had increased in double proportion to that of England, and if wood had continued to be the material for shipbuilding, we would long ago have surpassed, in that industry, Great Britain and all her colonies combined. In 1895, our ocean tonnage was 838,187, having gotten back almost precisely to what it was in 1828. This ought to be very satisfactory to Mr. Smith, as absolute protection, in which he is a firm believer, has brought it there. It was in 1855 that iron shipbuilding, having been demonstrated to be a success, began rapidly to supersede shipbuilding of wood. England and all other nations excepting the United States became cognizant of this. No more wooden vessels were built in Great Britain. Iron steamers and iron sailing ships became the order of the day. British shipyards were open to the demands of all nations. All of them, including Brazil, China and Japan, repealed their antiquated registry laws—all of them excepting the United States, whose domestic shipbuilders controlled and still control legislation—and allowed their people to build or buy ships in England. This practice led to shipbuilding in their own countries in course of time. Consequently, since 1855, ship-owning and shipbuilding have increased enormously in every maritime country on the globe, excepting in these nominally free United States, in which they have been driven back to where they were in 1828.

Mr. Smith tells us that we could not sail ships if we were allowed to own them. What, then, is the harm of permitting us to invest our own money in our own way, and to try the experiment at our own cost? But I deny his assertion outright. It is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an insult to the intelligence and business capacity of American shipmasters. He says that we would be obliged to pay higher wages. Well, from my experience, commencing at 1834, and continuing for thirty-five years in various capacities, from the forecastle to the quarterdeck, in those palmy days of American shipping, I know that we always paid higher wages, especially to the officers, and we paid for a great part of that time higher wages to seamen also—and they earned them. They were mostly Cape Cod and Cape Ann boys, such as manned the "Constitution," and gave her the victory over the "Guerrière" in time of war, and gave us the victory over our rivals in time of peace—such sailors as we have not now, for our registry laws have driven them from the ocean, and forced them to dig clams or to earn their living on the shoemaker's bench. I have not a word to say on disparagement of the many sailors who are regularly employed in some of the liners that come to New York, but sailors in general in all the ports of the world are the mere slaves of landlords, who sell them to the highest bidder, without regard to flag or nationality. We can buy them as cheaply as others. The only difference in the cost of sailing British and American ships now is that our officers in some instances are paid a little more, precisely as they were in times past. As to the claim advanced by Mr. Smith that it would cost 27 per cent. more to feed sailors on an American than on an English ship, it may be set aside by my testimony that in many voyages in late years across the Atlantic I have frequently inspected the food served out to the men, and have invariably found it far superior to the cabin fare we used to have in days gone by.

To satisfy my readers that Americans can sail ships were they permitted to own them under their own flag, and at the same time to show the devices to which our people are obliged to resort in order to participate in the carrying trade of the ocean, I quote the following paragraph from the report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1894 :

"The Bureau has endeavored to ascertain the extent of American ownership of iron and steel steamships under foreign flags at all Atlantic and Gulf ports. Such an inquiry, it was realized, approached close to private business affairs, and must rely for any measure of success solely upon the voluntary responses of shipowners. While the responses were far from complete, the courtesy of those engaged in naviga-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion has enabled this Bureau to prepare a statement upon the subject which, though adequate, is confessedly incomplete. The iron and steel steamers registered at Atlantic and Gulf ports for foreign trade on June 30, 1893, numbered 82, of 175,369 gross tons. They comprised 8 steel steamers, 24,247 gross tons, and 55 iron steamers, 108,295 gross tons of domestic build, and 5 steel steamers, 25,898 gross tons, and 14 iron steamers, 16,923 gross tons, of foreign build, admitted to American registry. From responses to the inquiries of this Bureau it appears that American corporations or citizens own the majority interest in 41 foreign steel steamers of 138,459 gross tons and in 23 foreign iron steamers of 53,649 gross tons. The total tonnage of this description under the American flag was thus 175,363 gross tons; under foreign flags 197,108 gross tons, for the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. The figures suffice to warrant the statement for the whole country that American capital owns a larger tonnage of iron and steel steamships in foreign trade under foreign flags than it owns under the American flag, even including 42,000 tons of foreign construction admitted to registry. . . . The United States Shipping Commissioner at New York reports that some Norwegian steamers at that port, in point of fact, are owned by Americans. They have not been included in the preceding summary of American ownership of foreign vessels."

Many of these American-owned vessels, to say nothing of others not included in the scope of the Commissioner's remarks, are commanded by American captains whom their own government condemns to sail under a foreign flag in order to gain their livelihood; and in case of war these, our own vessels, could be used against us. Would it cost any more to sail them if the Stars and Stripes instead of the British ensign should float from their peaks? It is a mere question of the cost of a few yards of bunting. Is it not a reasonable request that their owners should be permitted to hoist their own flags over their own property? And was it not a disgrace to the last Congress that a single individual should have had influence enough to defeat a free-ship bill that otherwise would have passed?

I come back to differential duties, in order to dismiss them as speedily as possible, for they require but little consideration and would have had none had it not been that the Republican party has fashioned them into a plank for its platform and that its candidate has heartily endorsed them. They were repealed in 1828 mainly because they were tending to bring about what would inevitably ensue should they be adopted now. The singular spectacle would be seen on the ocean of American ships going over to England and to other European countries in ballast and returning with full cargoes, while their foreign competitors would exactly reverse this process. All of them would neces-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sarily double their charges of freight at the cost of the shippers. Let us suppose the experiment to be first tried at Southampton. The enterprising "American Line" would cause to be inserted in the Manchester and Birmingham papers an advertisement to this effect:

"The United States government having decreed that there shall be a reduction of 20 per cent. (or of 10 per cent., as the case might be) on all duties, provided the goods are transported in American bottoms, shippers by our line are offered the superior inducements thus afforded."

Most certainly merchandise that might otherwise have gone by the Cunard line, or other lines from Liverpool, would be sent by Southampton. Does any sane man question what would be the action of the British government? Would it not instantly assess a corresponding duty on the cargoes of all incoming American ships? The argument that, her policy being free trade, England cannot afford to increase the cost of cereals and cotton to her people, would not count as it might if the tonnage of the two countries were reversed. The loss of the cargo which the four American ships could bring would be absolutely nothing when compared to what her own immense fleet and the fleets of all other nations, except ours, which does not exist, would bring to her on the same terms as before. The idiot does not live who would order ships to be built for the purpose of imitating Don Quixote in his fight against the windmills.

JOHN CODMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A STUDY IN CAMPAIGN AUDIENCES.

BY THE HON. LLOYD BRYCE.

HOWEVER we analyze the vote cast for Mr. Bryan, its size indicates that the principles he represents will hardly be relinquished at once, and that in four years the battle may have to be fought again. In short, we seem to have rather earned a truce than a victory. If the new administration is successful, if values rise and business generally with wages improves, the next fight will be less severe. If the new administration fails, the fight will be correspondingly more bitter.

Everything about Mr. Bryan is, therefore, interesting, as everything about this unique canvass is instructive for future reference. Under these circumstances I accept the invitation of the editor of the REVIEW to describe a few of the great public meetings of the recent campaign. I had the very best possible opportunity for observation, as I accompanied Mr. Bourke Cockran in his three trips. The first lay through Illinois, Nebraska, and Minnesota; the second through West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, and back through Illinois and Michigan; the third through Kentucky, Missouri, Virginia; and taken together they consumed over seven weeks. Thus we visited all of those States that are usually called the doubtful States, mixing with all classes of the community in public and in private gatherings. In fact, we traveled 10,300 miles and, with the exception of Mr. Bryan, I believe covered a greater amount of territory than anyone else has covered in the canvass.

On the evening of our departure from New York I was passing the Fifth Avenue Hotel, when a carriage drove up to the door, accompanied by mounted policemen. The light from the street lamps shone on the waterproof capes of the escort, for it was raining violently, and, amid considerable commotion on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of a hastily gathered crowd, a gentleman descended. I was informed that it was Mr. Bryan returning from his Tammany Hall speech. An hour later, on reaching Jersey City, we discovered he was to be on the same train. Shortly after it started we sent in our cards, and sat with him half an hour in his state-room. He was lying down. A fine type of manhood he seemed, with his clean-cut profile and his winning manner, talking courteously on every subject. Unconsciously I was reminded of Edwin Booth as he must have been in his younger days, and taken in connection with all the circumstances of his whereabouts, of Booth on a wide-extended starring tour. His manner was simple and unaffected, and marked by a certain earnestness that added to his attractions. His only allusion to politics was to express contempt for Democrats who proposed to support the third ticket while really intending to vote for McKinley. As we had ourselves openly endorsed McKinley from the first, the remark contained no sting for us.

He left the train at an intermediate station during the night and to our surprise next day in West Virginia his car was again attached to ours. It was rather an awkward situation now. Crowds lined the course and at every station cheers for Bryan resounded. Every now and then he would address them from the rear platform.

In connection with these wayside gatherings—which were mostly drawn from the surrounding country—I may be permitted to state that rural Populism is very different from that of the city. For the former embraces, I think, a far larger proportion of the well-to-do. It must not be forgotten, however, that social considerations are active in the country districts of the Middle States, while in the Southern and Southwestern States actual ostracism meets the seceder from the so-called Democratic fold. Besides, many who would follow their own dictates, such as small tradesmen, etc., whose business depends on the farmer, fear to lose their custom by a departure from the prevailing sentiment. All this makes Populism seem in the country well-nigh universal. But in the towns, and particularly in the great cities, "Hurrah for Bryan" seems more often the shibboleth of disappointed hopes.

While Mr. Bryan's speeches lack argument, and in print appear diffuse and tawdry, they attract the hearer. "What did he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say?" I asked of an enthusiastic bystander at one of the stations where he spoke a few words. "I don't know and I don't care," was the reply, "it was the way he said it." All this may be the effect of personality, of voice, of persuasiveness. But I think what really gives him his power is a certain note of prophecy, of self-believed inspiration, that he unconsciously breathes; for deep down in our national character is a strong religious bias, often developing among the emotional into hysteria and running into strange excesses. At one of his meetings later on in the campaign, I heard the flashlight was so arranged as to cast an aureole about his head when the crowd pressed round him in great numbers to touch the hem of his garments. The references in his speeches also, to the Crown of Thorns and to labor nailed to a golden cross play upon the same chord. In short, it is not alone the rôle of social reformer which he fills—there is the flavor of a wider promise in his utterances, and this it is that gives him, I think, his peculiar hold.

I have forgotten the station at which he left us in West Virginia, but an enormous crowd was awaiting him, and a committee marched him off to an adjoining hotel. As he passed us his appearance had entirely changed. He showed the strain of the campaign. He wore an expression, too, that I can hardly define, but somehow he gave me the impression of a man whose mind might at any time break down. And as the cheers died away and the train rolled on I wondered what would be the ultimate fate of this Rienzi of the West.

The most singular phenomenon about Western meetings is the disproportion between their size and the town that produces them. Why, they not only often seem to embrace the whole population of the town, but of several towns conjointly, and one might almost infer that their extent is in inverse ratio to the population they had to draw upon.

A curious psychological study they offer, too, these vast gatherings. I have often imagined the emotions of individuals are intensified by their combined numbers.

Victor Hugo in his lectures used to address himself always to the most stolid countenance among his hearers, feeling that if he could make an impression on him, the rest would follow. Dion Boucicault, the actor, assured me he always addressed himself to the occupants of the galleries, who, being drawn from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the poor and consequently less conventional elements of society, were quicker to respond, and consequently to encourage him. A popular lecturer whom I know regards his audience as one huge, conglomerate pink face—that smiles, that frowns, that weeps, that quivers—as a species of living composite photograph of the whole.

A clever stump speaker in explaining his success attributed it to the fact that he always regarded his hearers as children, and couched his remarks in language that the juvenile mind would grasp.

"An audience is a woman," a great French orator, now deceased, once observed to me, "subject to the same general rules that apply to the fickle sex. At one time it must be persuaded, at another caressed, at another bullied. It is full of moods." There is certainly something feminine in the quickness of a crowd's emotions. The intonation of a word may cause your audience to fawn upon you, or on the other hand to turn around and rend you. Perhaps it is half woman, half tiger.

The Omaha meeting presented a wide gamut of human emotions. Imagine several acres of humanity crowded well nigh to suffocation in a vast, but fragile frame structure, with the aisles and passages so blocked that the speakers could with difficulty force their way to the platform. In the centre and on the right the people were seated and mostly orderly. But on the left and in the aisles they were all on their feet shouting vociferously. The presiding officer vainly endeavored to make himself heard. As he proceeded, the noise and confusion increased, extending to the centre and right. The platform, too, was jammed, and as you sat there, you could imagine yourself on some low-lying strip of land, with an angry tidal wave ready to engulf you.

When Mr. Cockran rose to speak, one unhappily-turned phrase, one single look of flinching, would have precipitated a struggle, which, in the crowded condition of the building, might have been attended with a panic and loss of life. As it was, the phrase was turned happily and aroused their curiosity; another—between the shouts—attracted their interest; and in twenty minutes a pin could have been heard to drop. Then the orator went on to chide them, and, taking the late disorder as an object-lesson of what Populism would mean if enthroned in Washington, he spoke of patriotism and the country endangered by anarchy. As he pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceeded women became hysterical, men wept, and at the close, the sea, now changed from uproarious dissent to approval, swept forward and carried him in wild enthusiasm off the platform.

Here we have an audience—hostile as a whole—at least one-quarter of which had gone with the deliberate purpose of breaking up the meeting at any cost—an attempt, organized and disciplined. We had been informed of trouble before we arrived in the town, and later in the day, in the town itself, from the crowd that surrounded the hotel to meet us, a man drew me to one side and begged me to warn my friend that he would never be allowed to speak in Mr. Bryan's State. The whole meeting was against the speaker—uproariously and bitterly. To what psychological cause can we attribute the change from hostility to a demonstration in his favor that I have never seen equalled? I speak not without experience, for I have attended public meetings in many parts of the world.

It was not alone his gift of language; nor entirely his argument, great as it was; it was not even the recognition that a master was before them shedding a new light upon a grave question. All these were factors in the change. There was also the instinctive appreciation of an underlying sympathy with them, on the part of the speaker, which disarmed their distrust, and the vast gathering responded to it with greater quickness and fervor than any one of them would have done individually.

These public meetings are significant, as showing how disorder, confined at first to a few perhaps, gradually extends, unless immediately checked.

At St Louis the disturbance began on the outside. A business men's delegation, several thousand strong, came to the hotel to escort us; they were headed by a brass band.

Exasperated by this sign of approval, the hoodlum element congregated around the hotel doors in great numbers. Now, escorts have a disagreeable tendency in a crowded street to get ahead of their convoy, and particularly when inspired by the strains of music. It was so in the present case. The business men got a little ahead, so that our actual escort consisted of a body of Populists, who danced about our carriage to the refrain of "Hurrah for Bryan," diversifying their antics by occasionally shaking a fist in disagreeable proximity to our faces. Nor was our uninvited bodyguard willing to leave us on our arrival at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hall; for they burst through the doors, driving those waiting about the portals ahead of them into the already packed building, and blocking up the aisles and every available space. When you reflect that this was the convention hall where so short a time before Mr. McKinley had been nominated, you can imagine the crowd. It was variously estimated at between 15,000 and 20,000 people. I had already asked the Chief of Police to be particular in keeping the aisles clear. He had not expected, I suppose, this sudden invasion.

This clearance of the aisles is a very important matter. The eye of the speaker is like that of the lion tamer, and the entire audience must be subject to his gaze. There is a sort of silver thread between their eyes and his which, once broken, the spell is destroyed and his control over them is lost. There is another advantage in keeping the aisles clear; it will diminish the panic and the consequent loss of life which sooner or later I believe is destined to come in some of those enormous political gatherings. I remember with a cold shudder a balcony in a temporary frame structure. It actually seemed possessed—as it swayed with the changing emotions of its occupants. Below were perhaps a hundred persons, men and women, jammed together like sardines, as if awaiting, with that calm patience which distinguishes us as a people in moments of danger, its collapse. At one moment it seemed absolutely impossible that it should not shoot out from its supports and descend with a crash. Each burst of anger, every round of applause, it visibly responded to, and the entire building, being of wood, vibrated in sympathetic response, like a vast sounding-box.

At the Evansville meeting the resemblance to a sounding-box was rather due to the peculiar behavior of the disturbers than to the mere nature of the structure. When we entered the hall there was a considerable mob outside trying to press in and a considerable number inside trying to get out.

This created great confusion and scuffling about the doors. The police succeeded, however, in clearing the exits, whereupon the mob, enraged by the action of the authorities, scattered down an alleyway on which the building sided. Here they remained till the meeting closed, shouting threats of hanging, blowing horns, and singing, and by way of accompaniment, pounding, kicking, and battering on the walls of the building.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was like talking in an iron foundry—for, the evening being sultry, an upper tier of windows had been left open. As results prove it was the most effective meeting, however, held in Indiana. When the disorder was at its height, and the audience showed signs of going out and suppressing it themselves, Mr. Cockran stayed them. "No, no," he cried, "this noise, this confusion, this disorder, is my best argument. Behold the Chicago platform in operation!"

When we left the hall a rush was made upon the carriage. It was, however, stayed by the police.

The appearance of this crowd was worse than that of any I had seen. The faces of the men were such as you might expect to meet in the crowded cities of an old civilization, and not in an enterprising, flourishing, and prosperous young town. The oldest resident of the place, who was one of the reception committee, said as we were driving to the station that he wondered where these people had come from. He thought he knew every type in Evansville, but he had never seen this one before. I remember to have seen such faces only once before in my life, and that was at Victor Noir's funeral, in Paris, when I was a boy at school. They were the type of men who smell disturbance and discord from afar.

The hostility they evinced was exceptional, however. I wish to say, and I will say it here, that while we met bitterness—bitterness that increased with the campaign—and continual disorder, we encountered little vindictiveness.

Never can I remember a remark that by the wildest exaggeration could be construed into a personal insult. Yet in these Populists' eyes we were coming to destroy the gilded fabrics of their hopes—to try and prove what was, was right.

Opposed as I am to the tenets of Populism, revolutionary as I consider their propaganda, a sort of sadness would steal over me at the very success of our meetings, for each one might help to destroy the *silver* lining to so many clouds.

These people believe, and believe honestly, that free silver is the panacea for every financial evil, and the earnestness of their belief has dignity and pathos in it, mistaken as I consider that belief to be.

Speaking about public meetings, who, in his own peculiar way, had a more extraordinary power over them than poor John

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fellows? It was in Memphis that we ran across him. Peace be to his *manes*.

In the afternoon we went for a walk. I can see him now, as he stopped for a moment on the lofty suspension bridge which airily spans, like the hope of youth, the Mississippi River. To the right, up the stream, stood the city, perched on its lofty banks. On the left the sun was setting. Away beneath our feet a large Mississippi steamer, with its double smokestacks and its huge rear paddle-wheel, was passing under the bridge. She seemed to recall thoughts of other days, and his eye followed her sadly as she passed on down the stream. He came to the meeting in the evening and, being called upon to say a few words at the close, said them, as he always did, pointedly and eloquently.

The Norfolk meeting began with about half the audience standing up, then forming into angry groups. Each group had its own orator. The noise and confusion was increased by an accompaniment of falling benches.

A very singular circumstance I observed about this Norfolk meeting. During its entire continuation the audience, while subject to every other emotion, displayed no susceptibility to humor.

Dion Boucicault, to whom I have already referred, once told me that during a season's performance in London he had become aware that on certain nights his audiences would show a greater responsiveness to the humorous parts of his cast, on another night to the pathetic. So struck was he with the fact that he repeated it to several of his professional friends, and they resolved in their own performances to make observations and to compare notes. The result was the discovery of an unmistakable uniformity of sensitiveness each evening on the part of the audiences throughout the town. I believe the cause was attributed to atmospheric influences.

A like comparison of notes might be made by our different stump orators in the next campaign.

The disturber of the public meeting, being one of its integral parts and so large an influence in it, deserves—in his individual capacity—a passing glance in such a paper as I am writing. He appears in various forms and offers an interesting study in each.

The mere representative of disorder who shouts "Hurrah for Bryan!" belongs to the hoodlum class. Then there is the fanatic,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often partially educated, and occasionally a member of one of the liberal professions, perhaps a school-teacher.

I remember distinctly a man at Parkersburg who belonged to the latter class—of medium height, with a circle of dark beard, and a Quaker-like hat. Nothing would silence him. Again and again he rose to propound some question—such as the ratio of values—in a harsh, monotonous voice—determined and inconvincible—alike callous to argument and to ridicule.

Then there is the agitator who hopes to receive money or some other recognition from his organization for his services. He is usually fierce of expression—well dressed, but he wilts early. Then there is the crank pure and simple, long haired, wild eyed—the type of man who in ordinary times haunts the newspaper office with some scheme of aërial navigation or perpetual motion. There is also the flippant disturber who breaks in with some inconsequential question or witticism; usually he is the wag of the neighborhood. All these several types gain great local celebrity if they can succeed in confusing some well-known speaker. For months afterwards they are pointed out in the street as having "broken up" the famous Mr. So-and-So, and they hold forth as shining lights in the country store or in the particular saloon which they honor with their presence. But woe betide them if they fail! I can see a group of young men, congregated on the rear of the very stage on which we were, shouting "Hurrah for Bryan!" The speaker turned, and under his ridicule one after the other gradually dropped off like pears from a tree, leaving but the ringleader, who sat perched high up on some paraphernalia of stage machinery—for the hall was a theatre. A girl was near him and she tried to draw him away, but he resisted yet awhile. At last the ridicule focussed upon him was too much for him; he slunk down out of sight, pulled open a trap door leading below the stage and escaped into the street.

Some of Mr. Cockran's replies to these disturbers may well be recorded. For instance, to the young man who, interrupting, first declared himself a workingman, but went on to specify his avocation as the study of medicine: "Thank you," replied the speaker; "I have generally found," he continued with a sly smile, "that the work of the Populist is seldom of a manual nature. He is either a lawyer, who lives on other people's quarrels; a journalist, who records them; or a politician, who foments

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. You have added a fourth profession to the list. I trust you will extend your services to your political friends. The number of our opponents will certainly be reduced."

"How about the unemployed?" shouted a voice from the gallery of a great hall as the orator was explaining that three days' wages now had the purchasing value of five in 1873. "The honest unemployed, who really want work, are seeking it," shouts back Mr. Cockran. "The incorrigibly idle, and those who would never work even if it were offered them, are trying to break up orderly meetings."

At another gathering a tall, cadaverous-looking individual of the crank type, emerges from the crowd in the rear, comes excitedly down the main aisle and stops within twenty feet of the platform.

"Is not the legislation of this country," he asks, "under the control of the money class?"

"It is," replies the speaker. "And I thank God that it is so. For in this country the money class embraces everyone outside of an alms-house."

Occasionally, when the audience have been won over by the orator, they not only prevent but resent interruptions, and the cry of "throw him out" becomes general.

At Detroit, a man at the far end of the hall, in one of the aisles, was asking questions of the speaker—by no means in an offensive spirit, though in a persistent, annoying manner—when there was a rush in his direction. He was struck on the head, and, in the *mêlée* which followed, though I was too far removed to see the finale, I understood he was ejected very much the worse for wear.

Of all our meetings this one I think was the most instructive. It consisted of about ten thousand people and was gotten up by the labor unions for the purpose of propounding certain questions to Mr. Cockran. These were delivered in writing through the Chairman, and were answered offhand. Though considerable hostility was shown at first the meeting closed with the best possible feeling. Made up as the audience was entirely of working men its earnestness was impressive, and in the obvious yielding of their doubts to the explanations of the speaker, I read a happy augury, not only for the outcome of the campaign, but for the eventual settlement of that wider question—the true relations between labor and capital.

LLOYD BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DANGER POINT IN AMERICAN POLITICS.

BY JOHN E. MILHOLLAND.

POLITICAL reform is no longer a subject for ridicule. Through that stage of existence it has successfully passed. Only the dullest leaders fail to realize this fact. Even among those who look upon public offices as the prey of the victorious party, and to whom moral considerations seem out of place in caucuses or campaigns, there is a gradual awakening to the truth that to sneer at any of the various phases of this great popular movement is to appeal to an extremely narrow constituency and one that is constantly growing smaller in numbers and weaker in influence. Convinced at last that the low level of our political activity actually menaced the Republic, the people of this country, with characteristic courage, energy, and practical sagacity, have grappled with the perplexing problem, and to-day it is in the process of satisfactory solution. Ample justification for these statements will appear from even a cursory review of what has been done within the last few years to demonstrate that the purification of American politics is not, as the discouraged Kansas reformer rashly concluded, "an iridescent dream."

The retirement of the Republican party from control in the national administration a dozen years ago may be taken as a convenient starting point. Then the civil service law was scarcely more than an experiment. Nearly all the offices were outside the classified lists. Opposition to its further extension was so formidable that even President Cleveland was unable to resist the pressure brought to bear upon him by such powerful advocates of the spoils system as Mr. Gorman, and the Maryland Senator in this fairly typified the attitude of most politicians toward the reform. The practical leaders on both sides felt safe in denouncing it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still the movement went forward. President Harrison, one of the most practical politicians since Lincoln, came into office without any pretensions to superiority; and yet, before the expiration of his term, he rendered the cause more service than any of his predecessors, not excepting Mr. Arthur, another spoils politician, whose final convictions on the subject led to expressions of practical sympathy that should not be overlooked. The appointment of Mr. Roosevelt came at a critical period and was a powerful stimulus in the right direction. During his retirement Mr. Cleveland's ideas changed on many things, including civil service. In his message to Congress just before his defeat in 1888, he had not the courage to say one word on the subject. For this he has made the *amende honorable*. Since his return to the White House he has more than fulfilled the requirements of the most exacting advocate of the merit system. Under him the law has been extended beyond all expectation. Less than eight hundred exempted positions remain to trouble the peace of the President-elect.

While such amazing progress cannot be recorded in all the States and large cities, yet a commonwealth or municipality that is not included in the ever-widening scope of this reform is exceptional. Through the efforts of Mr. Joseph H. Choate, as presiding officer of the late Constitutional Convention, it is now part of the organic law of New York State.

Not less impressive are the results of the crusade for better election laws. In no political field can the purist find greater encouragement, not even the government service. The secrecy of the ballot has been secured in a greater or less degree of perfection in almost every State and Territory. Fraud and corruption have been eliminated from the work of election day to an extent that would have evoked endless derision had it been predicted ten years ago. But new developments, however startling, are taken as a matter of course in these days, and things over forty-eight hours old are forgotten. It is really necessary, therefore, for the proper appreciation of what has been gained on this line, to recall some of the conditions that prevailed in former days. And it is not necessary to go far back for the purpose of antithesis.

The enormous frauds perpetrated upon the ballot box by Tweed to elect a Governor of New York in 1868 are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

usually referred to as the acme of political evil-doing. This is a mistake. Tweed's efforts, though effective, were clumsy and transparent; and, in comparison with those undertaken by his successors, lacked system and comprehensiveness. He did not seek to go beyond the State; for the most part his efforts were confined to the metropolis. But since his day Tammany has been a deciding factor in at least one national contest. No politician familiar with the facts doubts that John Kelly's indulgence in the bad work which had become habitual with Tammany, and the supplemental efforts of other Democratic leaders throughout the large cities of the State, defeated Mr. Blaine for the Presidency in 1884. We are in a state of righteous indignation at present over the shameful work in Tennessee and Virginia on the last election day; yet less than four years ago as outrageous things were done right in New York City.

Previous to the adoption of the Australian ballot system here, the most conservative estimate of Tammany's fraudulent vote was from twenty to thirty per cent. In the downtown and water-front districts the Republican vote was as relentlessly and defiantly suppressed as it still is in Mississippi and Louisiana. In some election districts not one Republican vote would appear in the returns. So reckless did the violators of the law become at last that even the ballots of the Republican election inspectors were omitted from the sworn returns sent to police headquarters.

A comparison of the returns from the Eighth Congressional District, now represented by Mr. J. Murray Mitchell, which covers a part of the section of the city alluded to, illustrates these remarks. In 1892 the Republican vote was 7,132; the Democratic vote, 15,287. Two years afterward, with even an imperfectly amended law, the Republican vote was increased to 9,099 and the Democratic vote cut to 9,466. Last fall the Republican vote ran up to 10,488, while the Democratic vote was kept down to 9,2.9. In other words, the normal Democratic vote of the district, as shown by two Congressional elections, is a little more than 9,000. Consequently the fraudulent vote cast under the old methods was about 6,000, or 40 per cent. of the total Democratic vote. This is only a fair conclusion, and yet what a vista of fraud it opens up! And the vista becomes wider still when the returns from all the districts are considered.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another important result attending the operations of the new law is the curtailment of the use of money on Election Day. The evil has not been wholly eradicated. It is still possible to hire dishonest voters to stay away from the polls. But this device has never been popular, nor, excepting in the Fassett-Flower contest of 1891, has it been widely applied. Vote-buying on Election Day, either outright or in the form of "manning" the polls, was the established order of things. The amount of money expended by all parties was enormous. Twenty-five dollars was the usual amount allotted to each election district—there are nearly fifteen hundred of these in this city now—for this purpose by the Republicans on Election Day. This sum, however, was frequently doubled, trebled, and quadrupled. In a closely-contested fight Tammany would frequently raise the limit to two hundred and fifty dollars, but even that figure never dismayed the late John J. O'Brien when he was in control of the local politics of the Republican party. He has frequently been known to spend six hundred and seven hundred dollars in carrying election districts down-town, paying as high as twenty-five dollars for single votes, the usual price being from two to five dollars.

All this has been changed. Money can no longer be used for corrupt purposes on election day with any certainty that it will produce the desired effect. A few workers are still employed here and there, but merely for the purpose of getting them to register and vote. Every sensible person knows that the efforts of the past are now practically futile. It is useless to buy a man's vote when there is no guarantee possible that he will keep any agreement he may make. The hundred-and-fifty-foot limit of the law is not always regarded, but no worker can enter the voting booth or come within the polling place. And since even his own vote cannot be depended upon absolutely, what is the use of hiring him? It is not surprising, therefore, that less money was improperly spent on last election day than ever before in this generation. While a larger amount was raised and expended by the Republican National Committee in the late campaign than in any previous one, yet no presidential contest since the organization of the party compares with Mr. McKinley's campaign in point of cleanliness. The vast sums of money used went for speakers, literature, and other legitimate purposes. It was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the greatest campaign of education ever conducted. It was an honest, intelligent fight for the supremacy of right ideas, and those who refer to it as a "boodle" canvass speak from an imperfect knowledge of facts. Does it not seem incredible that a change could have been wrought within three years making dishonest elections impossible in New York, and anywhere else in the country outside of the Black Belt of the South?

There is an old adage in the Scotch Highlands, that we change faults instead of ridding ourselves of them. This is as true of political parties and nations as of individuals. However agreeable and encouraging it is to record the amazing progress that has been made towards higher moral standards in politics, it must be frankly confessed that the evils of the past have been transferred rather than discarded utterly. The civil service law has revolutionized the public departments and raised them immeasurably above the old plane; but it has also been used to protect in office incompetent and unworthy persons, and to create a certain bureaucratic class which, with its inner rings, secret combinations, and unsavory methods, inspires much of the antagonism to the reform itself. Almost every branch of the federal service is open to this criticism, and Tammany Hall to-day is maintained and supported almost entirely by its followers who are kept in office by an unwise and untimely extension of this law. This assertion may grate with all the unpleasantness of truth, but no intelligent believer in a thorough application of this reform who has examined the matter will hesitate to say that the new law is prejudiced by just such unfortunate misapplications.

While unfortunate, this is not fatal or even ultimately serious; it will be remedied by the natural development of the system and it requires only a passing allusion. The gravest abuses of the civil service are, after all, trifling in comparison with the evils that still flourish in connection with the other branch of the reform under consideration—elections. The general law on this subject has been successfully dealt with, but much of the evil formerly incidental to Election Day has been transmitted to the primaries. The vicious practices no longer possible at the polls are now employed in the caucus and in the nominating convention with an energy unparallelled in the past, although everything undertaken, no matter how villainous, is carried on in a manner entirely in keeping with modern methods.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Orderly procedure, to use a convenient term, is constantly aimed at. Isaiah Rynders, who, with his murderous gangs, broke up caucuses in the interests of Fernando Wood, and was rewarded for his work with a United States Marshalship by President Buchanan, does not find many imitators. Such work as his would now be impossible. His political descendants proceed more craftily but more effectively, though in reality they are no less flagrant in the violation of morals and of law. The party caucus or primary is to-day the danger point in American politics. The fountain head of power, it has become the fountain head of corruption. From it flow the evil influences that make unworthy nominations habitual, the machine possible, and bossism inevitable.

This evil, though long standing, has not been entirely neglected. On the contrary, much thoughtful consideration has been given to it. The efforts put forth in the large cities of the country to abolish it form an interesting chapter of modern political history. For twenty years or more the reputable Republicans and Democrats of New York have been striving to solve the problem. The measures that have been devised in furtherance of their purpose are numerous and varied. On the Democratic side the usual method has been to form organizations rivalling Tammany Hall, which has been, except at infrequently recurring intervals, the dominant organization of New York Democracy since the days of Aaron Burr. Perhaps the most significant was the revolt of Messrs. Whitney, Power, Hewitt, and other leading Democrats in 1880, which resulted in the formation of the County Democracy with a distinct plan of organization. It represented a serious attempt to get closer to the people than was deemed possible under the Assembly district system, which up to that time had been as a rule regularly employed by all parties. Instead of the Assembly district the County Democracy decided upon the Election district or voting precinct as their unit of organization and formed hundreds of these local associations throughout the city. Theoretically this was feasible; in actual practice it proved a lamentable failure, which was repeated in a subsequent test by the Republicans. In Brooklyn, Philadelphia, and other cities where the same experiment was tried the results were more satisfactory, but since it failed anywhere it cannot be considered a perfect plan. The strength of the chain is its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weakest link. To be satisfactory and safe a plan of organization must be capable of application to as vast and cosmopolitan a population as that of New York City or Chicago. Experience demonstrated that it was impossible to maintain interest in such small political centers and the district associations quickly passed into the control of a few lieutenants of the Assembly district bosses.

A few years after the County Democracy experiment the Republicans of New York attempted to set their local household in order. The disastrous result of the Presidential campaign of 1884 left things in a demoralized condition. A Committee of eighteen prominent members of the party was appointed by the State Committee to perform the task. Mr. Edward Mitchell, afterwards United States District Attorney, was selected as Chairman. The essential feature of the plan which they reported was a new enrolment conducted under boards of registry selected by the eighteen. The enrolment thus made was to hold only for one year; an annual repetition of it had to precede the formation of each new central committee to whom was entrusted the direction of the party's affairs. Like the County Democracy's plan, it seemed certain to bring about improvement in the nominating conventions, but its failure was evident within twelve months after adoption. The first enrolment under it was large and tolerably satisfactory; the second year it fell off, in some districts, two-thirds, so that difficulty was found in securing a quorum for the meetings. Thereupon it was decided to let the first year's enrolment stand and to add to it year by year. This was simply a reversion to the old ways. The district organizations dwindled in membership until they became again the pocket boroughs of the district leaders, the enrolment books their personal property. No one was allowed to become a member who would be likely to dispute authority or to stand in the way of a political deal with the other side. Revolts come to naught because the County Committee, composed as it was and is of these district leaders, is bound as a matter of self-protection to decide against every rebel to its authority. The County Democracy finally sank to Tammany's level, and united fortunes with the Wigwam; the Republican organization was content for years to be a mere Tammany annex. Its chief duty was to prevent a successful issue of honest non-partisan uprisings against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tammany misgovernment. This it performed usually by refusing, for fictitious reasons, to nominate men who had the confidence of the people and could be elected. It accepted instead a ticket practically dictated by the Tammany leaders. Of course a great party could not be trifled with in this way forever. The crisis was precipitated in 1893, when, in the face of a great Republican victory throughout the State, Tammany rolled up a larger vote than ever in this city, demonstrating beyond question the treacherous character of the Republican machine.

A reformation was immediately demanded on all sides. Two attempts were made, one through what was known as the anti-machine movement, the other through the Committee of Thirty. The anti-machine people, profiting by the example of the County Democracy on one point, insisted upon an entirely new organization. Their plan combined the best features of the Assembly district and the Election district systems. Unfortunately this movement was prejudiced in the minds of many people, owing to the pretended support of it by the leader of the Republican machine. It was commended, but not officially endorsed, by the State Committee which he controlled. It has remained a protesting power in the Republican politics of the city and State.

No less than eight months was spent by the Committee of Thirty in perfecting their plan of organization, which was essentially the same as that devised by the County Democracy, except in one important point—they declined to throw the old district bosses overboard. Instead they were actually entrusted to carry out the plan, which, if honestly executed, would, presumably, have made an end of the old machine. Subsequent events prove that none of them had attained political Nirvana nor reached the high line of self-abnegation. When the enrolment was held the old leaders, aided by their faithful ally, Tammany Hall, made it to suit themselves. Their resumption of control was complete. They threw the reformers overboard and stepped forward more strongly entrenched than ever. The experience of the Committee of Eighteen was repeated, except that the last stage of the old organization is the worst in history.

In confirmation of this statement it is only necessary to refer to the results of the investigations made a year ago by the Committee of Twenty-five, of which Mr. Cornelius N. Bliss was chairman. That committee was composed of leading citizens.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many of them had been identified with the Committee of Thirty, but they did not hesitate to expose the deplorable workings of their own plan of organization. It was indisputably shown that the local enrolment was from fifteen to forty-five per cent. bogus; that the organization was utterly fraudulent, and, in the opinion of the best constitutional lawyers in the country, without any legal status whatever. If the results of this evil-doing had been confined entirely to New York, they might not have seemed so serious. The aim, however, was not local, but national. In these frauds was laid the foundation for control of the State at a time when the State was expected to be a determining factor in a national Republican convention.

It is a sad confession to make, that after all the efforts expended to purify the primaries here, in Chicago, and in most of the large cities of the country, they are to-day more dangerously corrupt than ever before in history. Mr. William Brookfield, who has been repeatedly Chairman of the Republican State, and also of the Republican County, Committee, expresses an absolute conviction when he declares that New York politics were never upon such a low level as to-day. There is really no limit to the rascality. It is as bold as any in which Tammany ever engaged at the general elections. Nor is there any relief in the courts. Primaries and nominating conventions are practically without the pale of the law. There are several legal requirements in reference to them, and there are certain penalties under the penal code for their violation; but, substantially, party organizations are a law unto themselves. Their constitutions and by-laws are considered the law of the State and so construed whenever factional contests come up for judicial review. This has been repeatedly demonstrated. Attempts to right primary wrongs by such appeals are barren of results; not because of any lack of sympathy on the part of the judges, but because they recognize that the laws of the State do not cover party work beyond the general elections.

Why this vitally important department of political action should be left practically to mob rule, with an occasional spasmodic outburst of indignant corrective effort, is one of the oddities of our national existence. Good citizens are vehemently urged to attend the primaries, but they do not heed the appeal, and it must be confessed that they show much practical sense in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not doing so. It is not from a lack of courage, for there are thousands and thousands of citizens who would be willing to put up with the disorderly scrambles incidental to this practical work if their vote was going to be effectual. But they do not like to waste time and energy in a futile striving after that which would be denied them even if they earned it fairly.

This leads to a consideration of the remedy. There is one, and only one, and the sooner it is applied the better. It is simple, complete, effective, and the only wonder is that it has not passed into general practice long ago. It is not an experiment but an accomplished result, with five years' successful working behind it. Reorganizations, new organizations, Election district plans, Assembly district plans, new enrolments and re-enrolments, are at best insufficient so long as human nature remains in its present imperfect state, and a code of ethics is permitted to exist in politics that would not be tolerated at the card-tables of gentlemen or in the counting-rooms of merchants calling themselves respectable. It is a curious fact that a business man, who would reject with scorn a dishonest proposition in his financial affairs, will wink and smile at a packed caucus or the devious devices of an ordinary convention. The eminently respectable corporation officials who vote ten thousand dollars to buy members of the Legislature smile and say it is Politics. An hour afterward they are intensely shocked at seeing one loafer make an end of another's life, equally as useless to the community as his own, but they fail to see that their crime is infinitely more dangerous to the Republic than the murderous onslaught on their brutal fellow-being. What is the meaning of it? Simply that there is a moral perversion about politics as there is among the Mohammedan subjects of Abdul Hamid, and because there is it is unsafe to entrust reform to the ordinary sense of justice among those who are immersed in practical politics and dependent on it for a living.

But what is the remedy? We must do exactly as the people of Kentucky have done. We must put the primary elections, the caucuses, and the conventions as completely under the law as are the general elections. This is the only solution of the question, and until this is done we shall have, as in New York, party enrolments one-half fraudulent, caucuses controlled by the worst elements of the party, candidates that are utterly unworthy of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the suffrage of their constituencies, public officers who thrive by blackmailing corporations, debauch public morals, shatter the wholesome youthful ideals of public life, present false standards of official action and disgrace the good name of the American people. Kentucky has been a synonym with many people for lawlessness and disorder, but it has furnished the most complete election code existing in the United States. Its law on this subject represents the joint effort of both political parties. As a piece of reform legislation it is a model in its way.

All primary elections there by the various political parties are held and conducted in the same form and manner and under the same requirements as are the regular State elections*. Any act or deed denounced as an offence by the general laws of the State concerning elections is also an offence in all primary elections, and punished in the same form and manner as is provided for the punishment of similar offences by the general laws; and all the penalties and provisions of the general laws apply in such cases with equal force. The provisions are simple and easily comprehended. Whenever the governing authority of any political party desires to hold a primary election in Kentucky it must, forty days prior to such election, give public notice thereof by posting such notice at the Court House door and at least twenty other public places in the County or district. The notice must state the day of the proposed primary election, the hours between which it will be held, the offices for which candidates are to be nominated and the places at which polls will be open.†

The system of registration is perfect. All persons who are legal voters have a right to participate in the primaries, but in order that none but Republicans shall take part in Republican primaries and only Democrats vote at Democratic primaries, a system of registration is in force the salient points of which can best be given by quoting in substance the sixth section of the law. In all cities and towns of whatever class in which a registration law is in force under the provisions of the general law governing regular State elections, there must be set aside, on the regular registration books, space for the registration of all persons who may desire to take part in any primary election held by any political party. Such space must be provided on the

* Sec. 7, Art. 12, Chap. 65, Kentucky Election Law.
† Sec. 4, Art. 12, Chap. 65, State Laws.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regular State registration books immediately following the last perpendicularly ruled column in such books and must be headed "Party Affiliation." It is the duty of the judges of such regular State registration to ask each person who applies to be registered the question: "With which political party do you desire to affiliate?" And the name of the political party given by the applicant is recorded in the column provided in the books of registration for that purpose. If the applicant does not desire to state his party affiliation or identify himself with its activities, he is not, of course, required to do so, nor does his failure in this respect act as a bar to his registration for voting at the general election. The lists thus made up of Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Socialists, Prohibitionists, and any other political creeds, are posted and allowed to be copied by any person authorized to do so by the governing authority of any political party. These lists constitute the basis of the various party organizations and remain as such throughout the year.

Tampering with the rolls thus made up is a serious matter.

"The person or persons who shall add any name or names to the list of names contained in such book or books or shall erase therefrom any name or names, or who shall otherwise mutilate such book or books, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon an indictment and conviction in the Circuit Court, be fined not less than one hundred or more than five hundred dollars and be imprisoned in the county jail not less than sixty days or more than one year."

The same penalty applies to any party official who wilfully refuses to copy any name or names entitled to be so copied from the regular State registration book or books into the primary registration book or books. In the country districts where no registration is held all legal electors have the right to vote at any primary election if they conform to the conditions and qualifications prescribed by the committee or governing authority of the party to which they claim allegiance. This is sufficient, because as a rule the country caucus is fairly conducted.

The primary election inspectors are sworn in the same way as the inspectors of the general election, and any act or deed denounced by the general law as an offence in the case of officers of the regular State election is also an offence in the case of officers of such primary elections and punished accordingly. To tamper with the returns of the primary election is as bad in the eyes of the Kentucky law as tampering with the returns from a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State election. This is as it should be. The expenses of primary elections are paid for by the party organizations and the ballots are printed by order of the governing authority of the political parties. But they must be printed in accordance with the general law governing the printing of ballots in State elections. The penalties against election frauds are severe. To remove or attempt to remove a ballot from the election room, or to have in one's possession outside the election room any ballot either genuine or counterfeit during the election, is considered a felony punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary for from two to five years. No electioneering is permitted within fifty feet of the polls and any one who attempts to vote without the right to do so is liable upon conviction to be fined from twenty to five hundred dollars and to be imprisoned for from ten days to six months or both. Any attempt at ballot marking is punishable by imprisonment for from two to five years, and false impersonation by a fine of two hundred dollars and six months in jail. Disobedience of the lawful command of an election officer is punishable by a fine of twenty-five to five hundred dollars, and any public officer who fails to perform his duty as prescribed by the election law is liable to a fine of fifty dollars and two months' imprisonment. Withholding a certificate of election or the returns of an election is punishable by a fine of one thousand dollars, forfeiture of office, and disqualification from ever holding public position. Bribery is fined by from five to five hundred dollars and exclusion from office and suffrage. And bribe or bribery means in Kentucky "any reward, benefit, or advantage, present or future, to the party influenced or intended to be influenced or another at his instance, or the promise of such reward, benefit, or advantage." To break up, or attempt to break up, a primary election, or interfere with any qualified voter's exercises of his right, involves a fine of fifty to five hundred dollars and also imprisonment for a year. Perjury at the polls is punishable by confinement in the penitentiary for from one to five years. As if all this were not sufficient, Section 26 provides that this chapter shall be "liberally construed," so as to prevent any evasion of its prohibitions or penalties by shift or device.

For five years this law has been in operation in Kentucky to the complete satisfaction of both parties. Mr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

William E. Riley, Secretary of the Republican State Committee, declares that it works "charmingly," and his opinion, I understand, is echoed by Governor Bradley and such well-known Democrats as Senator Blackburn, who was largely instrumental in formulating the statute, Secretary Carlisle and ex-Governor Buckner. It should be the law of every other State, and when it is American politics will enter upon a new, healthful era of existence. Election reform will be complete and the purification of politics accomplished, so far as such things can be done in this world of splendid failures. Under the Australian ballot law the voter has absolute freedom of choice at the general election; when he has the same freedom in his party caucus or primary the end of bossism and machine rule will have come.

JOHN E. MILHOLLAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. BRYAN THE CONJURER.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

"RICHARD'S himself again! His soul in arms and eager for the fray!" Surely the horse of Scripture never ha-ha-ed so loudly or smelt the battle, so very far off.

Mr. Bryan's exhausting personal campaign, one of the most remarkable feats of physical endurance upon record, has left its inevitable mark. Hereafter life in inglorious ease becomes impossible; he must continue whirling about at high pressure, and seek excitement. While other leaders are taking their armor off, he appears in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, armed *cap-à-pie*, and begins a new campaign.

There is such evidence here of indomitable pluck that we cannot help admiring, much as we find ourselves admiring Milton's Satan, strive as we may against such deadly sin.

> "What though the field be lost
> All is not lost; the unconquerable will
> And courage never to submit or yield."

But as we read Mr. Bryan's new order of battle our admiration halts. Milton's hero fought it out upon the same line to the end. We expected like courage in Mr. Bryan, and our disappointment is great. Our chastened champion falls into a type quite inconsistent with the heroic. From Satan's pluck to Falstaff's caution is a great change, but in one sense we cannot help being glad that he has made it, and concluded like the fat wight that after all "the better part of valor is discretion."

The vital issues of the Chicago platform are dropped; of the plank denouncing the Supreme Court as constituted, no trace is left; of that denouncing Federal interference to quell riot, there is not one word; of the socialistic issue and the fomenting of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strife between the "Haves" and the "Have-nots," there is no mention. Yet compared with these issues the question of the money standard, important as that always must be, was as nothing.

The country could undergo the loss and misery certain to flow from a dangerous experiment with money, but the triumph of these revolutionary issues would have been fatal to its life as a nation founded upon law. Mr. Bryan's discard of the anarchistic planks of the Chicago platform at the first opportunity need, however, create no surprise, because he very clearly indicated more than once during the campaign his dislike of these features of the platform, every word of which he was forced officially to accept. Thus, although his platform denounced the Supreme Court as constituted, yet he declared that he was not opposed to such life appointments as the Constitution prescribed.

Upon another occasion when treating of Federal power to quell riot or rebellion, he resented with much spirit the charge that he would not "enforce the laws," saying "my opponents know better." It should not be forgotten that he also notified the Populists that "he did not agree with them upon some points." The writer believes the popular instinct to be sound, which differentiated Mr. Bryan personally from his associates, whom, however, it seemed probable, if elected, he could not shake off, and who must necessarily form his Cabinet. Had Mr. Bryan not created a more favorable impression personally, than his leaders, the majority against him would have been infinitely greater. Assurances were not wanting from those who knew Mr. Bryan that he was even younger in some other ways, than in years, and still a dweller in Wonderland, believing to be real the phantoms he saw, and that he was inherently honest in the views he expressed; but no one intimated this of the men whose somewhat guileless tool he was forced to become. We have only to put the nominal and the real leader in juxtaposition to understand the difference: Altgeld—Bryan.

Accepting the view indicated of Mr. Bryan's nature and character, we understand his failure to pay attention to facts, or to human experience, or to the arguments of his opponents, and his tendency merely to assert and declaim, making things convertible which are inherently different, and using terms in different senses until he has become the victim of self-deception, and ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pears before us as a Conjurer, making that so, which is not, and that not so, which is.

Conjurers perform many of their feats by the adroit use of duplicate receptacles which can be substituted or pressed into each other. Mr. Bryan seems to attempt a few in the REVIEW, for each of which these appliances are indispensable. That the performer is honest and takes matters seriously and is unconscious of any trick is not doubted. This is what makes the entertainment so interesting.

The first is the well-known "Bimetallic-Free-silver" trick. For this two thimbles are needed, one labelled "Bimetallism," the other "Free Silver."

The first line of his article announces: "The battle between bimetallism and the gold standard is on." "Bimetallism," thimble No. 1.

Before the bottom of the page is reached it is: "The free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation," which challenges the gold standard. "Free Silver," thimble No. 2.

The trick is to fuse these two thimbles, which is successfully done by pressing No. 2 thimble over No. 1, thus keeping in sight only one thimble, "Free-silver Coinage."

Bimetallism has then vanished. Bimetallism and free silver have become convertible terms; so clever!

A difficulty arises, however, by one refusing to fit into the other. The two thimbles are found not only to be different, but antagonistic. Bimetallism does not mean the "Free coinage of silver by the United States at 16 to 1," and "Free coinage" does not mean "Bimetallism."

No party has denounced the attempt to confound the one with the other so strenuously as the bimetallic; no men so influential in defence of bimetallism as Professor Walker and President Andrews; none more indignant at Mr. Bryan's attempt to confound the newcomer, "Free silver at 16 to 1," with the old "Bimetallism." The bimetallists of England, France, Germany, and other European countries also refuse to

President Andrews, although opposed to free coinage by the United States alone, concluded, however, to support Mr. Bryan. Professor Walker naturally was found more consistent. He has opposed free coinage since 1878 as fatal to bimetallism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sanction the proposed merger. This was to have been expected, since the only bimetallic league ever formed was that among European nations, which fixed the ratio between silver and gold at the market value of each metal at the time, and when the market value of silver fell, all promptly ceased to coin it.

The reason why honest believers in bimetallism denounce Mr. Bryan for his attempted jugglery is because bimetallism means the use of silver and gold freely as money; the so-called double standard, and free-silver coinage at double its market value means monometallism, a single standard. The standard in that case lies between the two metals; it is gold, or it is silver. If compelled to choose either, bimetallists prefer gold. They will not favor any measure that can possibly drive gold from circulation as money, and they believe that the free coinage of silver by the United States alone at a ratio of 16 to 1 would certainly do this. Hence as bimetallists they denounce free coinage of silver as fatal to a double standard.

It is too bad that "Bimetallic" thimble No. 1 refuses even to co-operate, much less to be obscured by, "Free-silver" thimble No. 2, and thus prevents Mr. Bryan's repetition of the trick, which he is said to have performed several times before wondering crowds during his flying canvass, when there was no opportunity for the bimetallists to expose his unfounded assumption. Nevertheless, several times in his article Mr. Bryan still insists upon the two thimbles being convertible terms; but No. 1 knows not No. 2. They stand apart, and so the trick fails. It cannot be performed any more. Mr. Bryan cannot fail sooner or later, as an honest man, to realize just what is involved in representing these different policies as identical or even harmonious.

Mr. Bryan's experience in his so-far vain efforts to find congenial company and a fixed abode has rarely been equalled in the life of one so young. We see how the bimetallists disown him and deny the alliance which he so strangely asserts. The official as well as the non-official leaders of the Democratic party parted company with him not long since, and he was driven to seek a home among the Populists; but here also he brought trouble to his kind hosts, and a large section of that party, naturally viewing him with suspicion, since he has expressed his non-concurrence with them in some points, has failed to give him the heartiest of welcomes. He flies about

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and nowhere finds rest. Let us hope the wanderer may yet rest somewhere when he learns wisdom by sad experience, and begin a useful career, for he should be capable of great things. One thing is sure; he must soon either drop "free coinage" or "bimetallism," for no man can consistently advocate both; and who knows but that the study of "Money" may bring him to the knowledge of the fact which history teaches—that the gold standard alone brings great and permanent prosperity to a nation.

Feat No. 2 is known as the "East and West" trick, and, like No. 1, requires two thimbles, No. 1 labelled "Farmer, Fifty-Cent Dollars," No. 2 labelled "Wage-Earner, Hundred-Cent Dollars." These being produced, Mr. Bryan proceeds to address Western audiences, and shows thimble No. 1, "Fifty-cent dollars," saying (page 708), "The advocates of free coinage insist that falling prices are but an evidence that gold is rising, and they assert that the rise in the purchasing power of an ounce of gold is due to legislation, which has increased the demand for gold."

The value of dollars is, therefore, to be reduced by legislation—the free coinage of silver, to give less purchasing power to the dollars in which wage-earners are now paid. Mr. Bryan says present dollars are doubly over-valued, and when cut down to one-half of their purchasing power, justice will be done; the farmers are to have these cheaper dollars to which they are justly entitled in which to pay their debts and their laborers.

Addressing Eastern audiences, thimble No. 1 is slipped aside, and No. 2 "One-hundred-cent dollars" is produced. He then declares that he "believes that under free coinage silver would rise to 1.29 par with gold"—thus keeping dollars at their present gold value and cheating the farmers of the West out of the cheap dollars he has promised them from the free coinage of silver.

Now, to perform this feat successfully, it is necessary that the East and the West should not hear what the performer says to both. It was partially accomplished as long as the performer remained in the West and used only thimble No. 1, "Fifty-cent dollars," but in an evil hour he was tempted to visit the East and to believe that he could safely drop thimble No. 1 and perform there with thimble No. 2, provided by his Eastern managers, "Hundred-cent dollars," and that this would capture the Eastern wage-earner.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thimble No. 2 was therefore produced in the East, but the substitute for No. 1 was instantly detected and No. 1 was enquired about. Then upon Mr. Bryan's return to the West thimble No. 2 used in the East was enquired about there, and ex-President Harrison was promptly pressing for explanation; and soon a thousand orators and newspapers East and West thundered of the discordance between thimble No. 1 and thimble No. 2. The result was fatal. The people East and West revolted. New Jersey, an Eastern Democratic State, 85,000, and Illinois, a close Western State, 140,000 majority, and similar results elsewhere, was the answer to what seemed an attempt to delude either the East or the West, by one aspiring to the highest political office upon earth. So fell trick No. 2, never to be again successfully attempted, and also fell the candidacy of Mr. Bryan.

It was too bad for these wicked newspapers and orators to spoil the trick by showing the Eastern thimble in the West and the Western thimble in the East, when they knew very well each was intended by the Conjuror only for its own section.

Readers will feel that the writer cannot easily reconcile the part here attributed to Mr. Bryan with the belief he expresses in Mr. Bryan's inherent honesty of purpose. This is true. Let us recognize this as one serious lapse, of which let us hope Mr. Bryan long since began to repent, and for which he still continues most sincerely to pray for forgiveness. Perhaps he has some theory which reconciles the statements to his own satisfaction; it is even possible that he had not thought of the fact that cheaper dollars meant reduced earnings to the vast majority of his countrymen and the confiscation of one-half the savings and life insurance of that most precious class, the industrious, sober, workers. Such a discovery was calculated to alarm the conscience and confuse the brain.

Feat No. 3 is that of "Money and Prices." Mr. Bryan says:

"When we determine kind and quantity of money we determine the level of prices, and the level of prices concerns every family in the land."

As quoted before, he also says:

"Falling prices are but an evidence that gold is rising."

This is a very pretty trick, and we bespeak the careful attention of readers. Three thimbles are used, because the term "Money," as used by Mr. Bryan, is made to include two differ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ent kinds, with one of which only is it possible to produce the optical delusion necessary for the performance of the trick. Thimble No. 1 represents "Sound money, gold"; No. 2, "Debased silver or Fiat paper money"; No. 3, "Prices."

"Thimble No. 1, sound money." It is not correct to say that "kind and quantity of money" fix the level of prices, provided the money is Sound Money; thus, "kind and quantity of money" remained the same during Mr. Bryan's canvass, and yet in the level (average) of prices, such startling changes took place as wheat rising 40 per cent., cotton about 20 per cent., while stocks fell 17 per cent., and silver fell six per cent., and prices of other commodities varied, some rising, some falling.

If the United States government doubled its supply of standard money—gold—from its surplus revenue, there would be no great advance in prices; but only such slight advance as might be caused by the greater confidence inspired by such splendid evidence of the financial power and wealth of the country. The surplus gold not required to settle balances or for exchange of commodities with foreign lands would stagnate in the vaults, and that in use throughout the country would circulate more slowly, and thus absorb part of the surplus; we have no inflation of prices to fear from too much gold.

Gold has never been found except in small quantities and with less variation in amount and cost than any other metal suitable for use as money. But just because silver in recent years has been found in enormously greater quantities than before, and is produced at very much less cost, civilized nations, one after the other, have discarded it for use as money, as they would promptly discard gold for the same cause if any other metal suitable for the standard became less variable in supply and cost.

Genuine money is an article of intrinsic value, the metal in every coin being worth in the market the amount stamped upon its face as money. Variations in the supply but very slightly affect prices for several reasons, the chief one being that for 95 per cent. of all business the "standard" never comes into action. It is only held in reserve to act as a medium for settling foreign "balances," now and then, and for redemption of notes based upon gold payment, which is seldom required if the finances are so managed as to inspire confidence that the existing stand-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ard will be maintained. It cannot be true that it is the rising price of gold which has caused falling prices, because if the standard metal had affected prices one way or the other its effect must have been uniform. Prices of all the principal commodities would have felt the influence equally. Now by far the greatest user of money in the country is labor. More money is paid for labor than for anything else, and the proportion paid in actual "money" is vastly higher than in any other branch of affairs. Labor has not fallen; it has actually risen 27 per cent. since "the crime of '73." Wheat has fallen seriously, but it has just risen again from 65 cents to a dollar; so has steel fallen greatly, even more than wheat and it remains at the lowest, but meat and Indian corn have not fallen correspondingly. One untimely blast of frost, or a little too much or too little rain, changes the level of prices of all the products of the soil more in a night than the gold standard has done in a thousand years. One invention made, or one mine discovered, brings down manufactured articles to one-half their former prices. Mr. Bryan's revolutionary platform caused prices to vary more in three months than the "appreciation" of gold has done since silver was the dearer metal at 15½ to 1, seventy years ago. Silver-standard countries show just the same startling changes in prices of commodities. "Free silver" does not—can not—stop them. The "standard," whether gold or silver, has no more power "to fix the level of prices" than to regulate the tides.

Mr. Bryan besides complaining of the appreciation of gold, denounces as outrageous the extortionate rates of interest exacted by the "gold bug conspirators," but where are the rates of interest highest? In gold-standard or in silver-standard countries? The foremost apostle of the gold standard is Great Britain, which is the cheapest market for money; it has gone begging there at two per cent. for a long time—the very rate at which the Grangers think the government of the United States should lend money. The writer knows that the principal manufacturing and commercial concerns of Great Britain have not paid so high as two per cent. for money advanced them by the gold banks. In France and Germany interest rates are low. In our own country manufacturers have been offered money by these calumniated institutions within a year under three per cent. per annum, even to-day it is offered at four per cent. per annum

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and declined. The "silver bugs" in silver-standard countries obtain double and even three times the interest "exacted" by gold bugs under the gold standard. Mr. Bryan should really ponder over this. Capital is as powerless to extort high interest for its use as to increase the purchasing power of gold.

Thimble No. 2, "Fiat paper or debased silver money," is now produced. Here is debased money, which has less intrinsic value as metal than the stamp proclaims, and here is also fiat money, which is only "paper promises to pay money," issued sometimes by governments in distress upon their own account. It is upon these two kinds of "Money" Mr. Bryan relies to produce the optical delusion necessary to persuade people that the "kind and quantity of money fixes prices." Thus the Confederate government issued "promises to pay money," until a pair of boots cost $700. Mr. Bryan's statement to the farmer, based upon such "Money," seems correct; the more promises to pay money, or debased money issued, the more the purchasing power of the dollar is reduced, the greater the apparent rise in prices, the greater the paying power of the dollar, and the easier for debtors to pay debts which may have been contracted under genuine money. This kind of "Money" seems to fix the average of "prices," since the rise in prices is contemporaneous with its issue, but not, as Mr. Bryan would have people believe, owing to the appreciation of gold, but to the depreciation in the value of the "promises to pay," or the debasement of the coin. Cost in gold of the pair of boots, which in Confederate "money" cost $700, remained just what it was before the issue of the Confederate "money." No appreciation or depreciation of gold occurred; a gold dollar would always buy a dollar's worth of anything substantially upon the former average of prices. The "fiat money" might jump up or down, as silver money does, three times in one day, sometimes, in silver-standard countries, but gold never. It knows neither appreciation nor depreciation beyond a range so narrow as to be of no practical account, differing therein from every other form or kind of "Money," hence its superiority as a measure of value. When Mr. Bryan talks of falling prices being "only an evidence of the rise in value of gold," he is in the plight of the unfortunate man who explained his battered face to the policeman, when picked up. "The wicked pavement had risen and struck him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hard." When Mr. Bryan finds leisure, a short study of the history of "Money" will soon prove to him that one of the invariable troubles with the kind of money he has recently been so anxious to inflict upon his country is liability to this very attack of the solid gold, which sooner or later brings debased money to a reckoning. Mr. Bryan's "kind of money" soon becomes unsteady when sent forth, and never ceases to stagger until it reaches its level and lies prone upon the standard gold pavement below. The pavement does not rise, as Mr. Bryan supposes. Mr. Bryan sees the sun rise and set, refuses to reject this evidence of his senses, and insists with Parson Jones that the sun moves round the earth.

The trick is successful only when he persuades his audience to accept these optical delusions as scientific facts.

Bimetallists believe in the quantitative theory—"More 'Money,' lower prices; less 'Money,' higher prices." Hence their advocacy of restoring even erratic and unsuitable silver as "Money" "at some ratio to be fixed by civilized nations after careful study of all the conditions."

Mr. Bryan also stands by the quantitative theory—but how students must smile at his amusing belief in the desire or ability of the great financiers to "corner" the standard. Page 706 he says:

"The advocates of free coinage have asserted that the gold standard is a conspiracy organized by the great financiers of the world to lessen the volume of the world's standard money for the double purpose, first, *of raising the purchasing power of a given quantity of money*, and, second, of making it easier to corner the supply of standard money."

The rapid increase of gold must soon give these people pause. The writer has reason to know that more than one of the best-informed bimetallic leaders are already discussing the point whether or not the divergence in value between gold and silver has become too great to be bridged; and, further, whether the greatly increased supply of gold already secured, and likely to be annually augmented, is not solving the question of the money standard in the best possible manner. We are apt to forget that gold is as clearly an American product as silver. No country produces so much gold as the United States; indeed, the annual product now exceeds in value that of the less valuable metal.

Gold last year was mined to the extent of 213 millions, equal to five per cent. of the world's stock; the population of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world increases upon the average just about one per cent. per annum. Here we have an increase per capita of four times the quantity required to prevent the appreciation—and which must cause depreciation—of gold, according to both bimetallic and free-coinage doctrine, and this surplus supply has been going on for several years, with every indication that this and future years are to find it annually increased. Should even the present supply be maintained, advocates of a change from the gold standard—should any survive until another campaign—will have to meet the contention of those who may admit the quantitative theory, but yet ask if the remedy is not being applied quite fast enough through the increased supply of gold. Four years hence they will be able to point to 16 per cent. increase in the total stock of gold beyond the increase of the population then, and of 20 per cent. increase based upon present population. Besides this, the financial centres of the world are now connected by cable, the total gold reserve can be transferred to any point in a few minutes, so that one ounce of gold now does the former work of ten as the standard. For these and other reasons the writer predicts that when the next President is to be chosen, bimetallists and free-silver coinage advocates will be almost unknown. From their point of view gold will not only have ceased to appreciate, but will have by that time "depreciated" so much that the supply of the almost ideal metal for the standard of value has fortunately become abundant, in their opinion, not only to keep values steady, but rapidly and steadily to reduce the purchasing power of the dollar.

The writer will not be understood as attaching importance to bimetallism; he does not believe in the quantitative theory and is certain that no "International Ratio" is either possible or desirable unless based upon the market value of silver and gold as metals, as all money should be and all sound money is. The members of the Senate Committee charged with obtaining another conference upon the subject are to him objects of pity. The wonder is how men can be found willing to play the part; but he rejoices that the basis of the demand of Bimetallists and Free Coinists alike for a change of standard—viz., the lack of gold—is being most effectually swept away.

Mr. Bryan's new platform consisting of one plank, "the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free coinage of silver, 16 to 1," thus promises to be as obsolete in 1900 as the unlimited issue of "greenbacks" was in 1896. The Republic will have passed that stage in its career during which financial vagaries have power to delude, and decided that the test of sound "money" is whether every coin contains the value as "metal" in the markets of the world which is stamped upon it as "money"; and when paper is used in preference to coin, that the paper must be redeemable upon presentation in coins which stand that test.

Since these lines were penned we have the address of the Chairman of the Bimetallic League to his fellows, than which nothing can more clearly show the different views of Mr. Bryan, as a Free Coinage man, and the Bimetallic League. The one begins another crusade, the other counsels acquiescence in the verdict recently rendered by the people until the party elected to power should have a fair chance to prove the soundness of its policy in maintaining the gold standard.

It need not be assumed that with the passing of Mr. Bryan's new platform there comes also the passing of Mr. Bryan himself; on the contrary, it is far from improbable that he may yet play a great part.

He is evidently earnest and sympathetic, with a thorough belief that he has a mission. Of his powers it is unnecessary to speak. He is an interesting individuality, whom one cannot help wishing to follow and study.

The discovery of such a couple, and such a home as that of Mr. and Mrs. Bryan—for she seems almost equally remarkable with her husband—is something at which our country may well be pleased, and may be pointed to as the product of Triumphant Democracy. Both models of purity in their simple lives, wholly free from ostentation, kind neighbors, and earnest in their desire to do their part toward making the world a little better; and, to crown all, ardent lovers, devoted heart and soul to each other, the wife standing nobly at her husband's side throughout all his trials. It is a beautiful picture, difficult to equal, impossible to excel in other lands. That they are grievously at fault in regard to human society and its complex problems—not as to its ills, but as to their cure, or what is far better than cure, their prevention—is only what we should expect. What young, inexperienced, generous heart has not begun by being in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dignant at the contrasts, the sufferings, and imagined wrongs of humanity, and lent itself to the advocacy of nostrums for their cure, the adoption of which would only spread and aggravate the very ills it would so fondly extirpate. Yet these are the characters which in after life often learn to substitute evolution for revolution, and do most genuine good, because, upon investigation, they find that human society is not, as they at first supposed, composed of warring elements, but that each of its parts is mutually dependent upon the permanent prosperity of all. The country cannot cease to retain kindly interest in Mr. and Mrs. Bryan, nor to expect to hear of them in the future; nor can the American people as a whole, without regard to party, fail to be deeply touched by the sweet, humble, loving home—the true palace of all the virtues—which the political campaign has revealed to the world, nor to pray that for many long, happy years to come it may be preserved.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

CAN WE DO AWAY WITH FOG?

"NEW YORK, November 7.—For forty consecutive hours the fog has had uninterrupted and impenetrable reign over the city, bays and rivers for fifty miles around. Navigation is fraught with great danger, and travel by rail is delayed one-half to two hours. Transatlantic steamers are greatly delayed, and no European mail has been delivered in the city since Monday. The Fall River line steamer "Priscilla," which left Newport last night, had not reached her pier up to 10 o'clock this morning. Several hundred passengers are on board. Several collisions occurred in the rivers and harbors, but none serious in results."

"Forty-eight hours later, one of the largest Sound steamers went ashore in the fog, on the north side of Great Gull Island."

Items like the above probably pass from the mind of the average reader a few minutes after the time of reading. The traveller, however, who has hung 'twixt sea and land, knowing himself to be almost within touching distance of the latter, has a livelier memory of the fog and the danger in which he was placed. Within a pier's length of their dock, when a dense fog prevails, our ferry-boats and river steamers bump about and feel their way inch by inch, to the imminent peril of the passengers.

Fog in its right setting—the upper air—fog is both pleasing and significant; but resting close to earth, it is "an unmitigated nuisance." It was so characterized by the English university professor, to whose work reference is made below; and with neither hesitation nor reservation will most travellers join in the frank and forcible declaration. Granted, then, that a cloud out of place, in other words a fog, is both a nuisance and a menace, are there any ways or means by which the undesired condition can be modified?

Three years ago the attention of the community was directed to the question of the artificial production of rain. The principle upon which rain was to be made, as it was commonly stated, viz., concussion of the air, was neither countenanced nor accepted by meteorologists. The results of the experiments were exactly such as were forecasted by men who knew the worthlessness of the claims then made, and yet fully realized that rain-making was nevertheless a scientific possibility. The rain engineer will some day be enrolled among the professional occupations. He will be one who has closely followed and clearly comprehends the physical processes of cloudy condensation. He must be something of the physicist, chemist and meteorologist combined. Problems such as Hertz solved in his graphic methods of following adiabatic changes in moist air, or von Helmholtz discussed in his papers on "billow" cloud formation will be appropriate work for him. The changes which a cubic foot of air charged with a given amount of vapor goes through as it moves from place to place in the atmosphere he will understand and control. Air at sea level at a temperature of eighty degrees Fahrenheit, half-filled with moisture, has eleven grams of water vapor in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each kilogram of air. If the pressure is suddenly changed from 750 millimetres to 687 millimetres, the temperature lowered about fifteen degrees, certain conditions result. The air is in the condition of a soaked sponge, and has all the water vapor it can hold. If the mixed air and vapor can be lifted about four thousand feet the rain engineer can ordinarily form a cloud or fog. Conversely if he can increase the pressure and supply the requisite amount of heat he can alter conditions so that no fog forms or if it has formed, cause it to disappear. Provided we can control the thermodynamic conditions we can condense the invisible vapor of the air into visible cloud and, on the other hand, change the visible fog into invisible vapor.

Fog formation suggests fog dissipation; and the questions which we propose to discuss in this paper are, therefore, first: What fog is, how it is formed, and how we can do away with it.

Fog may form in at least three different ways; first, where the air is cooled by rapid radiation; second, where the cooling results from a mixture of different air currents, and third, where the cooling has been caused by an upward motion of the air. The first is the most common cause of fog formation, especially the so-called ground fogs. Radiation fog is formed most generally over surfaces nearly level when warm air comes in contact with the cold ground. Sea fogs occur when there is a marked difference between the temperature of the water and the air or when two currents of water of different temperatures are contiguous. Coast fogs and these are the most annoying and dangerous, are formed when inflowing moist air from the sea passes over a chilled land. In some localities, *e. g.* San Francisco, it happens that a mass of air warmed over the land is pushed seaward, absorbing a large amount of moisture. When a sea-breeze in turn pushes the air toward the coast the air is chilled from the rear, fog forms over the water and is carried landward.

Clear and quiet weather is favorable to the formation of fog; and the growth is generally from the ground upward. There are also differences in the constitution of fogs. Clement Ley, perhaps the keenest cloud observer that we have, divides fog generally into wet fog and dust fog. Of the former he says: "When the particles are large enough to be precipitated rather rapidly to the earth and yet not large enough to be called rain, we have '*nebula stillans*' or wet fog. On the other hand, a town fog is more apt to be a dust fog . . . the great cause of the persistence and opacity of town fog is the presence of carbon, which determines the conversion of vapor into fog particles . . . the name '*nebula pulverea*' is given to this class of fog." John Aitken has shown us within the past five years by means of a very sensitive dust counter, just how many dust particles there are in a cubic centimeter of air in different localities and in the same locality at different times. At Cannes, for example, he found 1,550 dust particles per cubic centimetre when the wind was from the mountains, and 150,000 when the wind was from the town. He has also shown us how close is the relationship between fog, cloud, haze, and the *number* of dust particles. If there are few dust particles there are few nuclei for condensation.

Without stopping longer on these questions, we pass to the work of Dr. Oliver Lodge, Professor of Physics at University College, Liverpool, to whom we made reference above. In a lecture before the British Association at the Montreal Meeting, in summing up the various ways of removing dust from air, Lodge mentions the following:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. Filtration through cotton wool and glycerine.
2. Allowing the air to settle.
3. Condensing the vapor in the air several times.
4. By keeping a hot body in the air for some time. This is what Tyndall calls "calcining" the air.
5. Discharging electricity into the air from a point.

The last named process is the one most effective and in our judgment one containing great possibilities when applied to fog dissipation. If we discharge electricity into dusty air we can remove the dust from the air, and removing the dust means control of fog. The writer has shown in public how wonderfully rapid and effective electrical discharges of very high potential are in scattering smoke and clarifying dust-laden atmospheres. Much might be said of certain experiments but for the present we will use Lodge's words to describe some of the curious effects of a brush discharge in dusty air, inasmuch as the experiments were original with him.

"A bell-jar of illuminated magnesium smoke was connected with one pole of a Vose machine. A potential able to give quarter-inch or even tenth-inch spark is ample and better than a higher one. The smoke particles very quickly aggregate into long filaments, which point along the lines of force, and which drop by their own weight when the electrification is removed. A higher potential tears them asunder and drives them against the sides of the jar. A knob polarizes the particles as well as a point, but does not clear the air of them so soon. If the bell-jar be filled with steam, electrification rapidly aggregates the particles or globules into Scotch mist and fine rain."

Dr. Lodge goes on to show how a small cellar may be cleared of thick turpentine smoke by a point discharge. There can be no doubt that air is speedily cleansed of its solid particles by a continued electrical discharge. Many practical applications of the principle suggest themselves, such as purifying the air of smoking-rooms, theatre galleries, and disinfecting the air of hospital wards. In fog dissipation the problem is simply an increase in the size of the dust nuclei of condensation, under gentle electrification until these settle, or, under powerful electrification, to cause a rapid scattering and deposition of the electrified drops.

Lodge wrote in 1887, "coming to this country, we lay for some hours outside the Straits of Belle Isle in the midst of icebergs and fog. Icebergs alone are not dangerous but beautiful. Fog is an unmitigated nuisance. Electric light is powerless to penetrate it, and as we lay there idle, it was impossible not to be struck with the advisability of dissipating it. It is rash to predict what can be done. It is still rasher to predict what cannot be done. I would merely point out that on board a steamer are donkey engines, and that these can drive a very powerful Holtz or Wimshurst machine, one pole of which may be led to points on the masts. When electricity is discharged into fog on a small scale, the fog coagulates into globules and falls as rain. Perhaps it will on a large scale too."

Less than ten years have passed since the suggestion was thus casually made of the possibility of fog dissipation, and in that time great changes have been made in electrical apparatus. All ships and steamboats of any size are now provided with dynamos, and the generation of a high potential current is a very easy matter. The insulation properties of various materials, such as mica and quartz, which were not in use ten years ago, make them available for use with high potentials. It is a comparatively easy and inexpensive matter by means of proper transformers in series to run up to a potential of forty or fifty thousand volts. Then with a suitable arrangement of terminals a network of fiery discharges might be made to stream out into the fog either from the mastheads or from suitable poles, and the electrification of the air be thus widely effected. Within a reasonable distance such discharges would certainly dissipate the fog and clarify the air.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of course, the supply of fog may be such that there would be no apparent diminution. But such cases are probably exceptional. It is to be remembered that, as a rule, strong winds do not prevail during fog, and that in most places the fog has well-marked limits and is localized. The task of dissipating the fog of a channel like that between the Hudson and East rivers at the Battery is not more formidable, provided every vessel passing kept its fog dispellers at work, than the removal of the snowfall of a single storm from Broadway by means of numberless carts and horses. We are at great expense and trouble to remove the snow or solid vapor of the air: surely we will not grudge effort nor count expense to do away with fog. Upon warships, ferry-boats, and at all terminal points and crowded localities, fog dissipators would save life and property. Perhaps the following scrap of history of our own metropolis, and not London, will give point to what has been said above:

"November 19.—A dense fog settled over the city and vicinity at daylight this morning, greatly delaying traffic. A serious accident occurred on Brooklyn bridge shortly before eight o'clock, directly due to the fog. While on the way to Brooklyn station the train was forced to stop about 200 yards from the station. The train behind came along at a rapid rate and a serious collision resulted. A brakeman had both legs cut off and cannot recover. The accident caused an immediate stoppage of traffic on the great structure."

Consider then, if fog can be dispelled, are we not criminally indifferent, if we make no effort to dispel it?

ALEXANDER MCADIE.

THE RAILWAY VOTE IN THE CAMPAIGN.

MORE than three years ago, in the pages of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW,* I called attention to the influence which the "Railway Vote" might exert in national politics. The proposition then under discussion was the possibility of organizing a new political party by combination of the various interests which are dependent on the prosperity of the railway companies. These interests include four classes, viz., (1) the railway employees themselves; (2) the holders of railway securities; (3) those engaged in allied trades and industries which are supported by patronage of the railways, and (4) such others, as tradesmen, boarding-house keepers, etc., as derive their living from the railway employees or the employees of the other trades and industries already referred to. The number of voters in this last category is, of course, impossible of accurate ascertainment. The other three classes, however, if united, would give a massed voting strength of over three millions.

"It is not, then, surprising," it was said at that time, "that enthusiasts should declare that it would not be necessary to do more than go through the mere form of organization—to call a meeting or two and issue a few pronunciamentos—for the leaders of the new party to be able to dictate a presidential nominee and the outlines of a policy to either of the two great parties."

The probability of such a movement at that time was confessedly very remote: although considerably less remote than was assumed by most of the critics who subsequently discussed the subject in the daily and weekly press. That the probability is still remote is not because the railway inter-

* *A Railway Party in Politics*, by Harry P. Robinson, NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, May, 1893.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ests have not grievances enough to justify almost any lawful form of organization for the defence of their rights; but a larger issue has arisen. In the late election it was the commercial prosperity of the nation that was at stake.

The immense majority of the railway vote was this year cast for McKinley. In the Eastern and Middle Western States, as well as in the States of the Pacific Coast, it is certain that not less than 80 per cent., and probably over 90 per cent., of the railway employees voted for the Republican presidential electors, in spite of the fact that not less than 50 per cent. of the number have heretofore been, and still are, Democrats. It is not necessary here to discuss what the effect of that vote was on the result of the election. Let it suffice to say that in at least seven States which are in the Republican column, the Republican majority was less than the number of railway votes which were cast for the Republican ticket.

It should be distinctly borne in mind, moreover, that these men voted as they did avowedly as railway men. Their movement in support of the Republican ticket was quite apart from and independent of the general movement of the Sound Money Democracy. To the motives which impelled the better element of the Democracy in other walks of life to vote for sound money, whether their motives were those of patriotism or of dislike of the individual planks in the free silver platforms, there was added in the case of the railway employees the conviction that the triumph of Mr. Bryan would mean above all else the prostration of the railway interests, and a consequent reduction in the pay-rolls of the companies, while what remained of the pay-rolls would be paid in a depreciated dollar.

We have now to reckon with an entirely new factor in American politics. The votes of certain races—the German vote, the Irish vote, the negro vote, the Scandinavian vote, etc.—have long been recognized as distinct entities in the political world. There has also been the agricultural vote, and the mining vote has had great power in certain States. Outside of these few grand divisions, politicians have heretofore lumped all the wage-earning classes together in one conglomerate "labor vote." That can never be done again. In this election the so-called "labor vote" has split within itself, and the immediate and most important result of that cleavage is the emergence of the Railway Vote. This fact in itself is of considerable importance; for, as has already been indicated, the railway employees as a political factor are of great strategic value. They cast directly some 800,000 votes* without any reckoning of their indirect influence: but the number of the votes is less important than their geographical distribution. They are scattered, with comparative impartiality, over the whole country. In all except some seven or eight States, they are numerous enough, by concerted action, to overcome the majority of either party in any normal election. They are relatively equally powerful in every congressional district and almost every county.

All this, however, which appears on the surface—any question of the actual direct influence which the railway men may have exerted in this

* The Interstate Commerce Commission gives the number of persons employed by the railways last year as less than 800,000, from which would have to be deducted a considerable allowance for minors, aliens, etc. But the figures of the Commission include only the employees of the railway companies themselves as enable to the Interstate Law. As a political entity the railway vote is of wider scope, including the employees of innumerable sleeping car, bridge, terminal and depot companies, as well as of fast freight lines and traffic associations, etc. The estimate of 800,000 votes, after making all allowances, is probably a conservative one.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

election, or which they may exert in the future—is of trivial importance compared to the deeper significance of the movement itself.

The Railway men's movement began very early in the campaign. The first "call" to railway men to organize was prepared on the evening of the day on which Bryan was nominated in Chicago. When the free silver campaign organization got to work, some weeks later, one of the first announcements which it issued was to the effect that "the working men are for Bryan." There were already at that time about 200 railway men's sound money clubs in existence, with a membership of approximately 100,000 votes, and the movement was travelling with a momentum against which no vociferousness of appeal or protest could make head. It is true that Altgeld with all that he stood for was for Bryan, and Debs with all that he stood for was for Bryan also; but Altgeld and Debs do not represent the workingmen of the United States. Few facts in this campaign have been more encouraging than the demonstration of the utter powerlessness of Debs, not only over workingmen in general, but over the railway men themselves.

To understand the situation it is necessary to go back two years. Before the American Railway Union, under Debs, in 1894, declared war against the railway interests of the country and, later, against the authority of the government, it had already put itself in an attitude of antagonism towards the older established labor orders in the railway service. The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen—these organizations had no sympathy with Debs in his fight and felt no regret at his defeat. Since then his influence has been steadily declining; and when in this campaign he appeared as a champion of free silver the railway men of the country were glad of the opportunity of publicly repudiating him; and the fact that the nation has cause to rejoice over is that in repudiating him, the railway employees of the United States have, once and forever, repudiated all that he represents.

Herein lies the great significance of the railway movement in this campaign. It was loudly proclaimed by every orator on the free silver side, from Mr. Bryan down to Debs, that this was a war of the classes against the masses. The railway employees took them at their word and they chose their side; and that was the side of the classes.

It was a war between all the forces of discontent on the one side and of law and order and respect for established institutions on the other. The railway employees deliberately declared that their part is the part of law and order and that their welfare rests on the maintenance of our institutions.

What was true of the railway men was true of all the better classes of workingmen in shops and mills and factories. Never has any issue been more clearly presented to any people. Never has the decision been more emphatic. Hereafter whenever the forces of Socialism rise turbulently to the surface—whenever Anarchy raises its head against the government—whenever again sectionalism and Communism and discontent unite together in conspiracy against constituted society—the American people can rest assured that the best brain and sinew of the workingmen of the country are on the side of righteousness. Hereafter if any Populist or Socialist ventures to draw a line through the American people and say, "Those above this line are plutocrats and upholders of the existing order," and "Those below this line are ready to join with us in working for a peaceful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution," he must draw that line *below* the mass of the workingmen, *below* the employees of the railways.

The fact of Major McKinley's election—regarding him as the emblem of what he represented in this campaign—is cause for rejoicing enough. Still finer is the fact that his election was by the greatest popular majority ever given to a presidential candidate. But incomparably more glorious yet is the fact that in this fight employer and employee stood side by side, that the attempt to array mass against class has failed, and that we know now that when the crisis arises there can never be a solid "labor vote" on the side of discontent, but that the better element of the workingmen are a fixed bulwark against the flood of rebelliousness and unrest. And so long as that bulwark stands the republic is safe.

HARRY P. ROBINSON.

BOSS RULE IN OLD ENGLISH MUNICIPALITIES.

ENGLISH peers, for the first time since the Reform Act of 1832, are again in municipal politics. Last year there were eleven mayors of provincial towns and cities who were of the House of Lords. The number in 1897 it seven. This revived interest of peers in municipal politics began at Carlisle three years ago, when the Earl of Lonsdale became mayor. The next year it showed itself at Sheffield, where the Duke of Norfolk was chosen mayor by the Town Council in anticipation of a Royal visit. The Duke of Norfolk signified his willingness to take office months before the annual municipal elections in November, with the result that the fad of choosing peers quickly spread to other towns, and has been one of the features of the two last municpal elections.

The present connection of members of the House of Lords with provincial municipal politics has been described as a revived interest. It is really a revival; for, prior to 1832, peers and men of the landed class who were ambitious to become peers took a keen interest in municipal politics in many of the old Parliamentary boroughs. They had been taking this interest for three centuries prior to the Reform of sixty years ago; from the time, in fact, when seats in the House of Commons began to be in demand, and when it became of importance to a peer to be able to control Parliamentary elections in a borough or two. This interest of peers and of wealthy commoners working their way to a peerage by the aid of borough interest can be traced as far back as the time of Henry VIII. Cromwell took an interest in the municipal affairs of York; and in the succeeding reigns of the Tudor dynasty numerous cities and boroughs came under the protecting care of courtiers and aristocrats working with an eye to securing the nomination of members to the House of Commons.

Managing a borough with this aim in view was a comparatively easy undertaking in the first half of the sixteenth century. All that the manager, or, as he would be called in this country, the boss, had to do to introduce himself was to find men who were willing to serve in Parliament without wages. Wages were then paid by the constituency. From the first they had been hard to collect, and if a peer or a courtier suggested that he be allowed to name the two local members of the House of Commons, he generally had his way when his request was accompanied by the intimation that his candidates would put the borough to no charges. Occasionally the local recorder, who, like most of the lawyers of those days, was eager to be of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Parliament, offered to serve without pay rather than lose his seat. Sometimes also peers and courtiers making these requests were referred to the Act of Parliament which provided that members must be residents of the places they represented. But as a general thing, in the early days of the Tudors, boroughs easily succumbed when they were thus approached by peers; and on the easiest terms peers obtained the privilege of nominating members and thus established the interest of their order in municipal politics.

As time went on, and as seats in the House of Commons became increasingly in demand, peers were compelled to take a closer interest in the municipal affairs of the boroughs of which they were the patrons, and in various ways to do more for the local bosses in order to maintain their hold upon the nomination of members. Much evidence of this bossing of municipalities in order to control the Parliamentary elections is to be found in the letters and diaries and in the municipal literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

In the days of the unreformed House of Commons, when there was no uniformity in the electoral franchise, the Parliamentary boroughs in the control of the peerage and the landed aristocracy could be divided into three classes. There were those in which only the burgage holders voted; those in which the freemen elected the members of Parliament; and those in which the members were chosen by the corporations or the town councils. A burgage borough could usually be manipulated by its boss without much interference in municipal politics. If the patron, as he was euphemistically termed, did not own all the burgage lands and tenements, he made his bargain with the other owners individually. Nearly every burgage holder had his price. Sometimes it was a government appointment; sometimes it was a large sum cash down; occasionally it was a small annuity on terms duly set out in a written agreement. But in any case, except in a few instances, burgage owners were not a numerous electorate in any borough and a smart attorney could handle the burgage voters with ease.

In the freemen and corporation boroughs it was different. In those places the patron was almost compelled to be active himself and frequently on the scene in order to take care of his Parliamentary interests. He had to be ready at times to serve as mayor or recorder, and to go post haste from London to attend council meetings, when these officers or when aldermen or town clerks were to be elected. In the freemen boroughs the patron had to keep a sharp watch on the making of freemen to prevent his interest being swamped by hostile outsiders. To this end it was necessary that he should have the mayor and town clerk on his side. Unless they were with him, his interest was in danger. This was so alike in freemen and corporation boroughs. In a corporation borough the patron was compelled to keep on the right side of the aldermen, and to give close attention when aldermen were being elected. In these boroughs, the peer in control had usually a steward or an attorney, occasionally a parson, watching his interest. The bossing of the borough, however, could not be managed entirely by deputy, and a peer who had two or three of the old municipalities under his control had to be continuously on the alert.

Whether at his seat in the country, or in London, the patron had usually something to do with a view to maintaining his borough interest. In London, minor civil offices had to be procured for the local politicians and their relatives and friends. In those days, to the victors went the spoils in every

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

department of public life. The appointment of a local postmaster, or a collector of customs, or of inland revenue, occasioned the boss much correspondence and much running about from one State Department to another. After the Restoration, when parsons began to vote and to take an active interest in local politics, the rector or the vicar who was zealous in the interest of the local patron had to be taken care of when church preferments were being given out.

The prizes attending borough control and borough ownership were certainly great. They included offices at court, occasionally places in the administration, commissions in the naval and military services, contracts and loans, and peerages and promotions in the peerage. Yet, in reading the correspondence of public men in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, one wonders that any one thought it worth while to go seriously in boroughmongering, especially into that branch of it which involved a close connection with the sordidness of the eighteenth century municipal politics. As things stood, from the Restoration to 1832, dabbling in burgages was a gentlemanly kind of interest. What was objectionable in the business—such as juggling with title deeds, bargaining with grasping burgage-owners, and seeing to the due registration of burgage voters—could be relegated to attorneys. A century and a half of burgage-broking developed a race of attorneys who were experts in this work.

No one, however, will assert that managing a corporation or a freemen borough was a gentlemanly pastime. Much of the disagreeable work incidental to it was personal to the patron, and there was rarely complete rest from it. In London, as has been shown, the patron was not out of reach of the smaller bosses of his borough. They were always wanting recognition. It was the same when the patron got back to his estate at the end of the Parliamentary session. He was then brought into personal contact with his henchmen. If his home was in the neighborhood of his borough, he was expected to keep open house at some seasons of the year, and to wear a pleasant face whenever a group of aldermen invited themselves to dinner. When the shooting season came round part of the bag had to find its way to the tables of the local politicians. During the Pensioner Parliament, which assembled after the Restoration, Halifax partly bossed the newly-enfranchised town of Newark. His brother, Henry Saville, was one of the members; and while away in Paris he wrote Halifax not to forget to send a buck to Newark for the feast at the election of the new mayor on Michaelmas Day.

These mayoral feasts made large demands on the purses and the patience of both patrons and members. The diaries of the statesmen of the eighteenth century are freely interspersed with entries expressive of disgust at attending them—at drinking indifferent wine, and coming down for an evening to the social level of the aldermen and their wives. Patrons of boroughs had to undergo as much of this kind of social endurance as the members they nominated. Often a patron had to endure even more, because he was thrown more continuously with the local politicians than were the local members. Members of the House of Commons at this period were not expected to address their constituents on current political affairs. This claim of a constituency on its members disappeared with the cessation of the payment of wages, and it was not reasserted until the early years of this century. If a member nominated by a patron appeared at the Parliamentary election and at the recurring mayor's feasts, he was held to have discharged all his local claims. The patron did not desire that the member

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should appear more frequently, for he was often nervous lest the member might seek to set up an interest of his own and become independent of his patron.

The peer who bossed a municipality had to take office as mayor, when his interest demanded it, and to be on the watch at other times to secure the election of mayors who would protect his claims. How, as far back as the time of Charles II., these elections were brought about can be learned, among other sources, from the letters of Humphrey Prideaux. Writing from Oxford, he tells a friend that Lord Lovelace "hath been very busy making mayors at Woodstock and Wallingford." To carry his candidate in Woodstock, Lord Lovelace had been "drunk for three days with all the rag-tag" of the borough. Thirty years later, in Queen Anne's time, Lord Radnor reported to the Treasury how he was maintaining his interest in the boroughs of Bodmin and Lostwithiel. "The corporation of Bodmin," he wrote, "dines with me next Friday. I expect about four hundred persons that day. I had that number last time, and there did not go home five sober of the whole number."

The Reform Acts of 1832 and 1835 put an end to this kind of interference on the part of the aristocracy in municipal politics. There is not the slightest danger of the present fad of electing peers as mayors having a corrupting influence on English local public life. Still the practice of choosing peers is not without its disadvantages. Usually before a man is elected mayor by the town council he has served a long apprenticeship to municipal work as a member of the council. He has worked his way up to the mayor's chair by hard and gratuitous service on the various committees and given much of his time to the municipal business. His election as mayor, with its attendant honors and the place on the bench of borough magistrates that goes with it, comes as a reward for all this work. Almost every man who gives himself up to municipal service hopes, before his career comes to an end, to serve a term as mayor. When a peer is chosen as mayor, he has usually had no experience of municipal work. He has no record of municipal service behind him, and is pitchforked into the position over the heads of men who have been working their way towards this honorable and much coveted office. Peers also are seldom residents in the boroughs for which they are chosen mayors. It is true they are often the ground landlords of the towns; but they are not inhabitants in the old English meaning of the word, and are only technically eligible. Usually they do not discharge all the duties of the office. It is doubtful whether, in the face of the standing order of the House of Commons regarding peers and elections, peers who are mayors can act as returning officers at Parliamentary elections. For this and other reasons when a peer is elected mayor, there has to be a deputy, upon whom falls more work than is the lot of a deputy mayor when a commoner of municipal experience is chosen.

EDWARD PORRITT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED